

Current History

A WORLD AFFAIRS MONTHLY

JUNE, 1972

AMERICAN SCHOOL FINANCE: A HISTORY

FINANCING AMERICAN EDUCATION TODAY: AN OVERVIEW	
	<i>D. Bruce Johnstone</i> 273
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SCHOOL: EDUCATION IN COLONIAL AMERICA	
	<i>Robert Middlekauff</i> 279
THE RISE OF THE FREE PUBLIC SCHOOL	<i>William G. Carleton</i> 282
THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOL	
	<i>Ann M. Keppel</i> 286
GROWING FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION	
	<i>Harry V. Barnard and John Hardin Best</i> 290
STATE AND LOCAL EFFORTS TO FINANCE SCHOOLS SINCE 1945	
	<i>Peter D. Veillette</i> 293
FEDERAL FINANCING OF EDUCATION, 1945-1972	<i>Arthuryne J. Taylor</i> 298
AID TO NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS: HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL	
PERSPECTIVES	<i>Neil G. McCluskey</i> 302
CURRENT DOCUMENTS • <i>President Nixon on Equal Educational Opportunity, 1972</i>	305
THE MONTH IN REVIEW	312
INDEX: January-June, 1972, Vol. 62, Numbers 365-370	318
CHART • <i>Local Revenues for Education in the U.S.</i>	Inside Back Cover

Current History

FOUNDED IN 1914

JUNE, 1972
VOLUME 62 NUMBER 370

Editor:
CAROL L. THOMPSON

Assistant Editors:
MARY M. ANDERBERG
JOAN B. ANTELL

•
Contributing Editors:

ROSS N. BERKES
University of Southern California
RICHARD BUTWELL
State University of New York
MICHAEL T. FLORINSKY
Columbia University, Emeritus
HANS W. GATZKE
Yale University
MARSHALL I. GOLDMAN
Wellesley College
NORMAN A. GRAEBNER
University of Virginia
OSCAR HANDLIN
Harvard University
STEPHEN D. KERTESZ
University of Notre Dame
NORMAN D. PALMER
University of Pennsylvania
CARROLL QUIGLEY
Georgetown University
JOHN P. ROCHE
Brandeis University
A. L. ROWSE
All Souls College, Oxford
ALVIN Z. RUBINSTEIN
University of Pennsylvania
HARRY R. RUDIN
Yale University
FRÉDERICK L. SCHUMAN
Portland State College
RICHARD VAN ALSTYNE
University of the Pacific
COLSTON E. WARNE
Amherst College
ARTHUR P. WHITAKER
University of Pennsylvania, Emeritus

•
President and Publisher:
DANIEL G. REDMOND, JR.

Vice President:
ELBERT P. THOMPSON

Published monthly by Current History, Inc., 4225 Main St., Phila., Pa. 19127. Second class postage paid at Phila., Pa., and additional mailing offices. Indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Individual copies may be secured by writing to the publication office. No responsibility is assumed for the return of unsolicited manuscripts. Copyright © 1972, by Current History, Inc.

Coming Next Month

AMERICAN SCHOOL COSTS

Our July, 1972, issue, the second issue in a 3-part symposium, focuses on rising school costs in the United States, analyzing teacher costs, physical plant costs, the costs of extra services, parochial school costs, and the taxpayer's revolt against cost increases. Seven articles deal with:

American School Costs Compared

by JAMES W. GUTHRIE, School of Education, University of California

Teacher Costs in Perspective

by MAURICE LOHMAN, City University of New York

Rising Costs of Physical Plants for Schools

by BRUCE DAVIE, Georgetown University

Added Costs of Added Services

by MARK SHEDD, former Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia

Rising Catholic School Costs

by JOHN DEEDY, Managing Editor, *Commonweal* magazine

The Taxpayer's Revolt

by ROBERT LAMB, Columbia University

The Relation of Dollars to Excellence

by LARRY D. SINGELL, University of Colorado

Also In This Series

AMERICAN SCHOOL FINANCE: A HISTORY,
June, 1972

FINANCING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS TOMORROW,
August, 1972

HIGH SCHOOL DEBATERS: Note these 3 issues on the 1972-1973 N.U.E.A. Debate Topic

\$1.00 a copy • \$9.50 a year
Canada \$10.00 a year • Foreign \$10.50 a year
Please see back cover for quantity purchase rates.

NO ADVERTISING

Current History

JUNE, 1972

VOL. 62, NO. 370

The financing of America's public schools is a topic of grave concern to all Americans. This issue, the first in a three-part symposium on American school financing, describes the history of public education in the United States and the traditional patterns of school finance across the nation. How are American schools financed today? Our introductory article points out that "Nationally, the nearly \$42.5 billion spent in 1970-1971 on public elementary and secondary schools came 52 per cent from local, 41 per cent from state, and 7 per cent from federal sources. . . . taxation of some sort, applied by some level of government, lies behind all expenditures."

Financing American Education Today: An Overview

BY D. BRUCE JOHNSTONE

Executive Assistant to the President, University of Pennsylvania

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY education in the United States is a nearly \$50-billion business serving more than 50 million remarkably steady customers at some 100 thousand locations. About 90 per cent of this enterprise is "public," financed through a bewildering array of local taxes, bond issues, state and federal grants.

The financing of education, like the financing of virtually all public services, has always been a source of controversy, if for no other reason than the average citizen's distaste for being taxed. In recent years, however, the way we finance our schools has been recognized as fundamental to a broad range of social and educational issues. These include:

* *The equality of educational opportunity.* Can children receive equal educational opportunities if the quality of their schools depends upon the wealth of the district in which they live? Does local financing inevitably lead to unequal schools? Should state and/or federal financing equalize per pupil expenditures? Does this mean that a wealthy and educationally concerned community should be prohibited from spending as much as it wants on its schools?

* *The goals of education.* What are our schools doing and how do we know when they are succeeding or failing? How can we assume that we need (or don't need) more teachers, books, counselors, remedial classes, instructional equipment, or classroom space when we don't know how to measure educational "output"? What are the relative

costs and benefits of devoting extra resources to the pre-school, vocational, or college preparatory programs?

* *The efficiency of education.* Should districts servicing small student populations be consolidated in order to save on administrative overhead? Should districts specialize and share in small, high-cost programs such as automotive mechanics or classes for perceptually handicapped? What is the proper teacher-student ratio, and are there savings through the use of teacher's aids, large lecture classes, or instructional television?

* *Control of the schools.* Does increasing reliance on state and federal financing mean increasing state and federal control? Is there any reason why public financing has to imply public control? Could public support flow through students and parents by means of tuition tax credits or educational vouchers which could be cashed at any accredited, non-profit, privately controlled school?

* *The distribution of income.* Does the burden of financing schools fall heavily on lower and lower-middle income families through regressive local property taxes? Are state tax systems, based on income and sales, more equitable?

Public debate on school financing is often frustrated by such overlapping issues. What may first appear to be a debate on alternative systems of school finance turns out, instead, to be a debate over relative priorities attached to such goals as equality of educational opportunity, more and better schools, the replacement of regressive with progressive taxes, or efficiency and accountability in the classroom. The purpose of this

article is to outline some of the interrelationships between systems of school finance and the problems and/or new goals which might lead to various recommendations for new ways of financing elementary and secondary education.

SCHOOL FINANCING TODAY

The provision of elementary and secondary education has historically been delegated by the states to local school districts. Occasionally, districts are simply units of the local municipal or county government; more often, they are independent units with their own boundaries and the right to collect their own taxes. In 49 of the 50 states (all but Hawaii), these school districts rely upon local taxation for some portion of their financing, ranging from 86 per cent in New Hampshire to 19 per cent in North Carolina.¹

Locally raised taxes are supplemented by state grants apportioned among districts by complex formulas generally designed to provide some state revenue to all districts, but also partially to equalize total school expenditures in recognition of differences in local revenue-raising capacity. Obviously, state grants play a relatively minor role in New Hampshire and a very major role in North Carolina. In Hawaii, local financing has been eliminated, with state revenues providing all basic public education financing.

State aid formulas vary enormously, but most can be fitted within one of the following types:²

1. *Flat grants.* About seven states currently set school aid according to pupil enrollment, adjusted in recognition of cost differences due to such factors as total size, transportation costs, urban-rural salary differences or capital needs. Flat grants are not, however, adjusted according to differences in the local tax *base* (i.e., the value of taxable property) or the local *effort* (i.e., the rate at which that property is taxed).
2. *Foundation program plans.* Variations of this system, sometimes called the Strayer Haig formula, are used

¹ National Educational Finance Project, *Future Directions for School Financing* (Gainesville, Florida: 1971), p. 9.

² See Charles S. Benson, *The Economics of Public Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), pp. 154-190; and National Educational Finance Project, *Alternative Programs for Financing Education* (Gainesville, Florida, 1971), pp. 231-263.

³ The National Educational Finance Project distinguishes between a percentage equalizing plan, in which state funds "are allocated in inverse proportion to the taxpaying ability of the local school district," and a guaranteed yield plan, in which the state guarantees some tax yield per pupil, similar to the Strayer-Haig formula, but applicable to more than the single foundation tax rate. In fact, all three equalizing systems are mathematical variants. See N.E.P., *Alternative Programs for Financing Education*, pp. 235-237.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁵ Since interest on school bonds is exempt from at least federal taxation, such bonds can generally be sold at a low rate of interest. The lender—i.e., the bondholder—receives a tax break in lieu of a full market return on his capital. The school district benefits through the reduced cost of debt amortization. The actual source of this implicit subsidy to the school is the federal government, which has given up potentially taxable income. Any tax-exempt bond, then, is a device for shifting some of the "true" cost of debt amortization to the unit of government granting the tax exemption.

today by about 34 states. These states guarantee each district a minimum, or "foundation," level of per pupil expenditures as long as a certain tax rate is applied to the local property tax base. Ideally, that rate is set to enable the richest district just to reach the foundation with no state assistance. All other districts taxing only at that rate will fall short of the foundation per pupil revenues; state aid makes up the difference. The poorest districts are thus assured of at least minimum revenues without incurring burdensome taxation. Such a system does not actually "equalize" school expenditures. Most schools spend above the minimum amount, and their capacity to do so is primarily a function of their taxable wealth.

3. *Percentage equalizing grants.* Foundation grants guarantee a basic revenue yield from the single foundation tax rate. Percentage equalizing grants attempt to equalize the yields from all equivalent tax rates, regardless of the tax base, or wealth, of the local district. A district can still choose to bear a higher tax rate and thus spend more than another district, but state grants assure a poor district the same or nearly the same revenues as a wealthy one if it chooses to tax itself at the same rate. A variant of this system is the *guaranteed yield plan*, in which the state guarantees minimum per pupil revenues for each tax rate. Eight states are categorized by the National Educational Finance Project as having either a percentage equalizing or a full guaranteed yield plan.³
4. *State financing.* State assumption of all financing (except for federal categorical grants) should eliminate inequalities among school districts stemming from either tax effort or the tax base. Only Hawaii currently follows this model.

The federal government is a third source of revenue for the public schools, reaching most districts in widely varying amounts through one or more "categorical," or special purpose, grant programs. Before 1965, federal aid to public elementary and secondary education was limited to certain vocational education programs, assistance to school lunch programs and milk programs, and to general aid to districts "impacted" by children from nearby federal installations (e.g., military bases) which were non-taxable and thus unable to contribute a fair share to the local tax base. Since 1965, however, the federal government has assumed some responsibility for providing aid to public schools serving large numbers of low-income children. Such aid, principally under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, is now the largest component of federal aid to public education.

Nationally, the nearly \$42.5 billion spent in 1970-1971 on public elementary and secondary schools came 52 per cent from local, 41 per cent from state, and 7 per cent from federal sources.⁴ It should be noted that taxation of some form, applied by some level of government, lies behind all expenditures. Thus, expenditures for new construction met through local bond issues imply a future stream of taxes sufficient to repay the bondholder, who is simply the immediate source of capital.⁵

We should also note that about 10 per cent of our elementary and secondary students are educated in private schools, financed through tuition and fees, donations or support from churches or other sponsoring organizations. Private school receipts totaled about \$5 billion in 1970-1971.⁶

On the expenditure side, by far the largest cost item is instructional salaries, as shown in Table 1. Nationally, expenditures on public elementary and secondary education have risen about 8.5 per cent per year over the past decade.⁷ These increasing expenditures reflect the rise in all prices and wages; increased enrollments; and some increase in real per pupil expenditures brought about by lower pupil-teacher ratios, more instructional equipment and special services (e.g., remedial teachers, counselors, extra-curricular programs), and an increase in the wages of teachers relative to wages and prices for the economy as a whole.

Table 1: Estimated Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 1970-1971 in Thousands of Dollars

Institutional salaries	\$23,990,104
Other instructional costs	1,884,650
Maintenance and fixed costs	6,280,953
Transportation	1,414,399
Administration	1,407,108
Health Services	291,629
Not allocable to pupil costs	1,184,742
 Total current expenditures	 \$36,453,585
Capital outlay	5,061,361
Interest on debt	1,336,281
 Total Estimated Expenditures	 \$42,851,227

Source: Aggregate estimates are taken from Richard H. Barr and Betty J. Foster, *Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day School, Fall 1970* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1971). The estimated breakdown of current expenditures is extrapolated from 1967-1968 data reported in Gerald Kahn, *Analysis of Financial Statistics of Local Public School Systems, 1967-68* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1970).

Alternative systems of school finance can vary on three major dimensions: (1) the forms of taxation,

⁶ National Education Association, Committee on Educational Finance, *Financial Status of the Public Schools* (Washington, D.C., 1971), p. 21.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁸ The elasticity of the progressive personal income tax can also create problems. In the first place, tax revenues may actually outrun public expenditures, depressing total demand and perhaps inhibiting employment and economic growth—a problem which will correct itself, but at considerable economic expense. Second, a tax which is elastic “on the way up” is every bit as elastic “on the way down.” Thus, the yield from a personal income tax may fall precipitously in a recessionary period. This may be acceptable or even advantageous for the federal government which can maintain expenditures and borrow to make up the difference. States and local units, however, can deficit finance less easily, and a loss in revenues may necessitate expenditure cuts and a curtailment of public services.

(2) the level or unit of government applying the tax, and (3) the control over the allocation and expenditure of the tax revenues.

The forms of taxation. The most important forms of taxation for the purpose of this analysis are taxes on *income* (individual and corporate), on *consumption* (sales, gross receipts, or value added), and on *property* (principally, land, homes and other buildings, and tangible personal property).

Considerable attention has been given to the criteria of a “good tax,” generally including the following:

1. *Equity.* A tax should treat individuals in the same economic circumstances equally, and should generally rise in proportion to income. Progressive personal income taxes score high on this criteria; sales taxes, especially those including necessities such as food and fuel, score low.
2. *Economic neutrality.* Economic behavior—e.g., the location of plants and businesses or the incentive to produce efficiently—should not be unintentionally affected by a particular kind of tax. Few taxes, in fact, are strictly neutral. Personal income taxes, for example, may affect the choice between work and leisure; consumption taxes may affect the allocation of resources between necessities and luxuries. Taxes collected at a local level, however, especially on sales or business income, may have particularly capricious consequences, such as forcing business activity to locate on the other side of the jurisdictional boundary.
3. *Elasticity of yield.* The revenue from a tax should increase automatically with revenue needs. This generally suggests a tax which will rise with, even if it is not directly based upon, national income. A progressive personal income tax is highly elastic; its yield, in fact, may increase faster than incomes as a whole.⁸ A tax on sales or consumption is somewhat less elastic. The yield on property taxes increases more slowly with income growth.
4. *Efficiency.* A tax should be difficult to evade and collectable at minimal cost.

The property tax, which provides about 98 per cent of locally raised school revenue, does not fare well by these criteria. It is generally thought to be regressive, because poorer families tend to spend a higher fraction of income on housing than richer ones. The property tax may also discourage the efficient location of businesses and the maintenance and improvement of property. Finally, its yield does not rise proportionate to increases in income and economic activity, and changes in assessment policies and increases in tax rates are clumsy and politically vulnerable. The major and very strong argument in its favor is that “it is there,” and its abolition would demand large and sudden increases in alternative taxes. Sentiment is strong, however, for relying on other taxes for increased revenue needs and for gradually phasing out the local property tax as the state takes over more of the financing of public education.

Sales taxes are extensively used by state governments, and can thus be called an important component of public educational finance. Sales taxes are elastic and easy to administer. They may be more or less regressive, depending upon how extensively they fall on necessities such as food, fuel or clothing.⁹

A number of countries, most notably in West Europe, apply a tax on the *value added* to a good at all phases of the production process. Thus, the miller would be taxed on the price of the flour he sold to the baker minus the cost of wheat he bought from the farmer. The difference is the miller's value added. Presumably, each stage in the production process passes its tax liability on to the next purchaser through higher prices. The ultimate burden, as in a sales tax, is borne by the consumer.¹⁰

Income taxes are the principal source of federal revenue and are now levied by over 40 states on both personal and corporate income. They are generally considered superior on the criteria of equity and elasticity of yield, and stand up well to the tests of economic neutrality and efficiency of collection. State income taxes, however, vary widely in both extent of use and in progressivity. Even with income taxes, the tax systems of most states are at best only slightly progressive.

The level of taxation. Taxes, of course, are levied by all levels of government, from the independent school district itself to the municipality, the state and the federal government. Generally, we associate *forms* with *levels*; property taxes at the local level, sales and mildly progressive income taxes at the state level, and heavy use of the progressive income tax at the federal level. This association can be misleading, however. A number of large cities employ income taxes. There is considerable discussion today of a federal value added tax—a type of national sales tax. Finally, as mentioned earlier, the sales and income taxes employed by states vary greatly on criteria of equity, economic neutrality, and extent of use.

Thus, while a shift in taxation from one governmental level to another will often imply a predictable shift in the form of taxation, the principal effect will be upon the *regional distribution of public expenditures*. It is politically difficult to shift public expendi-

⁹ See Benson, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-128; and National Educational Finance Project, *Alternative Programs for Financing Education*, pp. 60-66.

¹⁰ Although "passing a tax onto the consumer" has a pernicious sound about it, such may be the case in many taxes. Most local taxes on business property and many of the federal and state taxes on corporate income, for example, are considered costs of production and passed on to the consumer like any other cost in the form of higher prices. Tax incidence—who ultimately bears the burden of any given tax—is an extremely complex question upon which there remains considerable disagreement among economists and tax experts.

¹¹ Robert W. Hartman, "The Serrano Case: Milestone in School Finance" (Washington, D.C.: the Brookings Institution, October 13, 1971 [mimeographed]).

tures out of the unit in which the taxes were applied. Thus, if taxes in whatever form are levied locally, they must generally be spent locally. States, however, could recover the same amount of taxes (whether levied on sales, property or income) and have at least some freedom to redistribute expenditures among districts or municipalities within the state. Similarly, the federal government, even if its tax were a property or sales tax, could redistribute expenditures not only among school districts but among states as well.

The growing sentiment for a shift of more school financing away from the local districts toward the states and the federal government, then, can be an expression of: (1) a greater reliance on those forms of taxation, especially the income tax, which are associated with state and federal levels, (2) the allegedly greater political stability of a tax which is more "removed" and less subject to local taxpayer pressures, or (3) a general redistribution and equalization of public expenditures. It is important to note, however, that inequality of school expenditures is a function not of the property tax, *per se*, but of local taxation. Inequality among districts would probably be as great (albeit with some shifting of the "haves" and the "have nots") were schools to be financed through locally raised sales or even progressive income taxes.¹¹ Similarly, a shift to more federal financing of public education through a federal value added tax could quite certainly promote a leveling of school expenditures, but might (depending on the form of the value added tax) actually shift the tax burden onto lower income families.

It is also important to consider the impact of financing provided by one governmental unit on that provided by another level. State aid can encourage a maintenance or even an increase in local financing by allocating state grants according to a local "tax effort" formula. On the other hand, state aid could discourage local taxation if the state grant were simply to make up the difference between locally raised revenues and some reasonably adequate "foundation" level of per pupil expenditures. Federal grants might similarly encourage, maintain or discourage state and local school financing. Those who view lack of resources as a major problem today might thus want a *maintenance of local tax effort* provision as a "string" to increased state or federal aid. Those who view schools as already wasteful and/or those who seek primarily to reduce the local property tax burden will welcome state and federal taxation *replacing* the local tax effort.

Expenditure control. Alternative systems of financing public education may also vary with respect to the control over the allocation and expenditure of those public resources—and hence over the very nature of public schooling. Increased federal aid, for example,

could flow directly to states, as in certain proposals for federal revenue sharing, with aggregate amounts earmarked for public education. The allocation of federal funds to schools could be placed in the hands of the governors' offices, the departments of education, the legislatures, or a special task force or agency set up specifically for this purpose.

Or federal aid could go directly to schools, on a formula of student enrollment weighted by other criteria such as socio-economic composition of the student body, regional differences in cost of living, or certain performance criteria. Such a system would probably reduce the power of state education agencies. The power of local districts could be reduced or enhanced depending on the strings attached to the federal aid.

Still another means of dispensing federal or state aid is to parents of schoolchildren, through educational vouchers, tax deduction or tax credits. Such a system would place "consumer power" in the hands of pupils and parents and drastically reduce the power of the local education authorities. Thus, while some control inevitably remains with the unit of government whose hand is on the purse strings, there are great variations in control and power relationships which may be built into any system of school finance.

REFORMING SCHOOL FINANCE

Today there seems to be little question that we need to find new ways to finance elementary and secondary education. (Higher education, in fact, is in even more desperate need of reformulation—but that is far beyond the scope of this article.) Both the National Educational Finance Project and the President's Commission on School Finance¹² have called for more state financing and a commensurate reduction in reliance on the local property tax. Some have suggested the substitution of a federal value added tax for the local property tax. Others are hopeful that federal revenue sharing can provide a massive infusion of aid to education, adding to rather than substituting for existing public resources. A few have urged a "market system" of finance through student vouchers rather than direct institutional support.

The difficulty with comparing and evaluating al-

¹² The President's Commission on School Finance (Neil McElroy, Chairman), *Schools, People, & Money* (Washington, D.C., 1972).

¹³ For an expression of this skepticism, see Daniel B. Moynihan, "Can Courts and Money Do It?" *The New York Times: Annual Education Review*, January 10, 1972, p. E1. The classic study often cited in support of this point of view is J. S. Coleman, et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

¹⁴ See James W. Guthrie, George B. Kleindorfer, Henry M. Levin, and Robert T. Stout, *Schools and Inequality* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971), and "Equal Educational Opportunity," *Harvard Educational Review* (Special Issue), Winter, 1968.

ternative systems of school finance is that similar proposals may be based on very different perceptions of the problem and hence on very different objectives. In addition, some objectives call for a change in the form of taxation; others for a change in the governmental level applying the tax; and still others for new patterns of control over the allocation and expenditure of public revenues. Since most proposals will have multiple objectives, goal priorities may determine which elements of a new proposal are most important and which are most amenable to compromise. Rather than look directly at whole new systems of school finance, then, let us look first at some of the goals underlying the various proposals and consider the systems of finance which might best reflect those particular goals.

One such goal is simply to *provide more public money to the schools*. This goal, of course, deserves some debate on its merits. There are some who question the overriding need for more or for more expensive teachers, buildings and equipment. They would claim that this goal overestimates the learning which money can buy and misses "the truly critical needs," whether those be curricular reform, greater efficiency, more community control, or an end to socio-economic and racial isolation.¹³

Others dispute this claim and maintain that added expenditures in large amounts and focused on well designed programs can make a difference, especially in compensatory programs for the disadvantaged.¹⁴ The local citizenry, however, is increasingly reluctant to bear higher property taxes. Proposals for more school revenues, then, generally look to the federal government. This is due in part to the greater capacity of the federal income tax to grow automatically along with general increases in prices and wages. Federal taxation is also somewhat removed from the scrutiny of the taxpayer. It is quietly collected through an efficient withholding system. It is imposed through laws and regulations over which the citizen has little control; and it goes to a vast array of expenditures, only a small part of which affect education. Maximizing the public revenue available for education will also call for "maintenance of effort" provisions to assure that states and districts do not lower school taxes and simply substitute federal aid for the state and local contributions. Better still, the federal aid might reward state and local "tax effort," giving greater amounts of aid to districts which increase their local property tax rates or to states which institute income taxes and increase school aid by certain amounts over preceding years.

A second goal might be a *more equal distribution of educational resources*. The principal problem recognized by this goal is the relationship between the quality of education as measured by per pupil expenditures and the wealth (and hence the tax base)

Table 2: Interstate Variations in School Expenditures, Personal Income, Tax Effort, and Tax Potential

	highest			U.S.		lowest	
	1	2	3	Average	48	49	50
1) Average current expenditures per pupil, 1970-71 (estimated).	\$ 1,370 ^a N.Y.	\$ 1,088 N.J.	\$ 1,088 Ver.	\$ 839	\$ 578 Ark.	\$ 521 Miss.	\$ 489 Ala.
2) Personal income per pupil, 1969.	25,976 N.Y.	23,166 Conn.	22,814 Ill.	17,615	10,898 Utah	10,777 N. Mex.	9,977 Miss.
3) State and local government revenues as per cent of state personal income 1968-69.	18% Wy.	17.4% No. Dak.	16.4% N. Mex.	12.8%	10.5% Ohio	10.3% Ill.	10.1% Conn.
4) Potential per capita yield on state income and sales taxes.	\$ 368 Nev.	\$ 344 Hawaii	\$ 294 Calif.	\$ 240	\$ 183 So. Car.	\$ 165 Ala.	\$ 148 W. Va.

^a Alaska spent \$1,429, but the source suggests a 30% reduction in that figure to compensate for the lesser purchasing power of the dollar in Alaska relative to the rest of U.S.

Source: Rows 1, 2, and 3 from National Education Association, *Rankings of the States, 1971*, Washington, D.C., 1971, Tables 110, 56, and 68, respectively. Row 3 from *National Educational Finance Project, Alternative Programs for Financing Education*, Gainesville, Florida, 1971, p. 72.

of the particular district or state in which a child may happen to live.¹⁵

A revolution in school finance may have begun on August 30, 1971, when the Supreme Court of California held that state's system of local financing to be in violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution. In the case of *Serrano v. Priest*, the court declared equal educational opportunity a basic right which should not be compromised because of variations in local revenue-raising capacity. Similar findings have been brought in *Rodriguez v. Edgar* (Texas) and *Van Dusart v. Hatfield* (Minnesota).¹⁶ All these cases leave unanswered questions, but clearly signal the end of the extreme disparities existing today in per pupil expenditures. One of the classic examples of inequality is found in Baldwin Park, California, with a per capita property valuation of \$3,697 compared to nearby Beverly Hills' \$50,885. Baldwin Park raises \$577 per pupil on a tax 2.3 times that of Beverly Hills, which nevertheless spends \$1,232 per pupil. The Rodriguez case cited a survey of 110 Texas districts in which a tax of only \$.31 per \$100.00 yielded \$585 per student in the 10 richest districts, while a tax rate of \$.70 per \$100 yielded only \$60 in the 10 poorest.

¹⁵ See Patricia Cayo Sexton, *Education and Income: Inequalities of Opportunity in Our Public Schools* (New York: Viking Press, 1961); Arthur E. Wise, *Rich Schools, Poor Schools: The Promise of Equal Educational Opportunity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968); and John E. Coons, William H. Clune III, and Stephen D. Sugarman, *Private Wealth and Public Education* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

¹⁶ For information on these cases, see Robert Rheinhold, "John Serrano Jr., et al., and School Equality," *The New York Times: Annual Education Review*, January 10, 1972, p. E1; Arthur E. Wise, "The California Doctrine," and Harold Howe II, "Anatomy of a Revolution," *Saturday Review*, November 20, 1971, p. 78; Robert W. Hartman, *op. cit.*; James A. Kelly, "Judicial Reform of Educational Finance" (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1971 [mimeographed]); and materials inserted by Congressman Orval Hansen into the *Congressional Record-Extension of Remarks*, January 18, 1972, p. E1 (daily edition).

"Equality" is a particularly elusive objective. Some questions following the *Serrano* ruling, for example, are:

* Will the *Serrano* ruling preclude one district from spending more on its schools than another if it wants to make an extra effort? Would "equality" be preserved if only the tax bases were equalized, allowing unequal spending so long as it resulted only from unequal tax rates or efforts? Isn't it likely that rich districts would still choose to spend more (i.e., tax themselves at a higher rate) than poor districts?

* Can we afford to "level up" all poorest schools to the expenditure level of the richest schools; and could we justify any "leveling down?"

* Will tax base disparities among rich and poor states, as well as between rich and poor districts within specific states, also be held unconstitutional?

A number of reforms might be prescribed, depending in part upon how these questions are answered. State aid, for example, could be distributed more "progressively" by eliminating all flat grants to wealthy districts and adopting much more generous "foundation" or "percentage equalizing" formulas. These grants might be complemented by additional aid to schools serving large numbers of educationally disadvantaged children. A more adequate response would probably be 100 per cent state financing of all school expenditures—even prohibiting expenditure of locally raised revenues. At this point, interstate variations in expenditures and revenue-raising capacity, as shown in table 2, would become the major source of unequal educational opportunity, and fed-

(Continued on page 309)

D. Bruce Johnstone is currently Executive Assistant to the president of the University of Pennsylvania. This article was written while the author was serving as a project specialist with the Ford Foundation studying educational loans and the financing of higher education.

Describing education in colonial America, this historian concludes that: "What emerged by the end of the colonial period was a peculiar blend of public and private, classical and vocational, religious and secular. Modern 'public education' had not yet been conceived."

Before the Public School: Education in Colonial America

BY ROBERT MIDDLEKAUFF
Professor of History, University of California at Berkeley

WHEN AN AMERICAN colonist discussed a "public school," he was not talking about the institution familiar to us since the nineteenth century; usually he simply meant a school open to anyone who wished to attend. The chances were that the school was privately owned and financed. The designation "public" was given to distinguish it from a school catering exclusively to a special group—usually a religious sect.

Indeed, the modern idea of "public education," implying a state-owned system of schools, supported by taxation, and administered by officials chosen by the community, which compels attendance of all children within a certain age group and which carefully separates itself from the educational efforts of private groups, did not exist in the colonial period. To be sure, the state sometimes participated in organizing and financing schools, but its role (outside of New England) was small. Instead, several other agencies assumed the burdens of education; chief among them were the family, apprenticeship, and private schools of various sorts.¹

Schools in the first years of settlement were scarce in all the colonies. Scattered settlement and scant resources discouraged attempts to maintain schools continuously. Thus in the first years education in schools was largely a temporary, even sporadic affair.

EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH

If education in the first years of settlement was much alike in all the colonies, it took on regional characteristics as colonial society matured. In the southern colonies—Virginia, the Carolinas, Mary-

land and later Georgia—where population always remained scattered on farms and plantations, geography prevented a neat structure of schools. Yet children were educated. A wealthy planter sent his sons to England to sit in one of the great grammar schools, or brought a tutor to the plantation, where he lived with the family. Smaller planters and farmers, especially in Virginia, sometimes combined their resources to build a "field school"—a building in a tobacco field, hence the name—and to hire a teacher to instruct the children living nearby. Boarding schools usually established by an ambitious college graduate or itinerant schoolmaster appeared late in the colonial period and were usually found only in the larger villages like Williamsburg or Charles Town.²

Tutors, field schools, boarding schools, were all maintained without any reference to public authorities. This was not true of most of the endowed schools of the southern colonies. Founded through the generosity of private donors, these schools were usually managed by county or parish officials—or a combination of both. Such officers found a place for the school's meeting, hired its master, and supervised its operation.

The most renowned of these institutions were the Symmes and Eaton schools. Both were founded around the middle of the seventeenth century from bequests of Virginians. Both were controlled by a board of trustees composed from county and parish officers. Symmes school secured incorporation in 1753; Eaton in 1759. During at least a part of its history each offered instruction in the classical languages as well as in reading, writing and arithmetic.³

Altogether nine such schools in Virginia survived at least a part of the colonial period. All in all, they were not of great importance for they took root in only seven parishes; eighty-three parishes had none.⁴ In the colonial South only the grammar school at the

¹ Bernard Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960), pp. 15-16.

² Edmund S. Morgan, *Virginians at Home* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1963), pp. 8-32.

³ G. F. Wells, *Parish Education in Colonial Virginia* (New York: Arno, 1923), pp. 32-39.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

College of William and Mary consistently received public funds.

THE MIDDLE COLONIES

The southern colonies were not unique; contributions from public treasuries in the middle colonies—New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey—rarely were given. Even Philadelphia and New York, large cities in the eighteenth century by English standards, did not direct municipal revenues into education.

An energetic and self-conscious denominationalism supplied Philadelphia with schools. First on the scene, the Society of Friends established elementary schools and a single grammar school shortly after Pennsylvania was settled. William Penn gave his encouragement by bestowing a charter on the grammar school in 1701. The Friends apparently needed no official endorsement, and throughout the colonial period they gave the schools vigorous support through private subscriptions and legacies.⁵

Other religious groups as eager as the Friends to preserve their identity and to perpetuate themselves maintained schools in Philadelphia. An Anglican parish school was begun in 1698, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel supported a charity school for poor children for most of the period before the Revolution. The Lutheran church opened a classical school around the middle of the eighteenth century, and the Baptists followed with the same type in 1755; the Moravians—never a rich group—began an elementary school in 1745.⁶

Besides these efforts—and probably equally important—were the numerous private schoolmasters of Philadelphia. The average private master displayed a variety of skills to Philadelphians. If his newspaper advertisements accurately stated his qualifications, he could teach everything from arithmetic to astronomy—including Latin and Greek, rhetoric, oratory, logic, navigation, surveying, bookkeeping, higher mathematics and natural science. His offerings were necessarily broad; he had to attract students since their tuition provided his sole means of support.⁷

New York, the other city of the middle colonies, could not match Philadelphia's denominational offerings. Still, its religious groups were important agencies of education. Under the Dutch in the first half of the seventeenth century, the Reformed Church maintained a school. After the English took over the colony in 1664, the church opened several more in

an attempt to hold its children to the old ways and to the old language. Though English culture eventually washed out the results, these attempts helped preserve Dutch homogeneity for years. As in Philadelphia, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel also proved active, sponsoring charity schools for children of the poor.⁸

New York could also boast numerous private schools in the eighteenth century with masters, judging from their claims in the newspapers, no less talented than those of Philadelphia. But, on the whole, education was neglected in New York. Perhaps the most auspicious development of the pre-Revolutionary period was the opening of a grammar school by the newly-founded Kings College in 1762. The college and its school promised to renew interest in education beyond the elementary level.⁹

Small towns and villages in the middle colonies lagged badly in education. A few parish schools struggled along in several; private masters taught reading, writing and arithmetic and occasionally vocational subjects like surveying; apprenticeship supplied most of the skilled crafts. If a boy desired advanced training in the languages or higher mathematics, he had to travel to New York or Philadelphia. By the late colonial period apparently there were many boys who sought such instruction, for the city schools were filled with students from the country.

This brief treatment of the southern and middle colonies suggests, perhaps, that a variety of agencies—each for its own purposes—promoted education. In New England a number of the same forces appeared: the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel sent out masters instructed to bring the dissenters back to the true faith; Baptists, Quakers and other religious groups strove to maintain schools purveying learning and their versions of Christianity; and in large towns and cities, private masters giving classical and vocational training flourished. Although this was in the familiar colonial pattern, New England, in education as in much else, departed from the familiar. The state made the difference by entering the field of education in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and (before it merged with Massachusetts) in Plymouth.

New England was settled by Puritans who, unlike some of the radical sects they left behind in England, valued education. The Puritans came to the New World imbued with a sense of mission. They had left the Old World to complete the Protestant Reformation, to demonstrate that they held the true conception of church polity and religious doctrine. The success of their task depended in large measure, they were convinced, on an educated community. Hence they wished to erect a system of schools equal to the task.

They wasted no time getting started. Six years

⁵ Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness* (New York: Putnam, 1955), pp. 123-24; and *Cities in Revolt* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 174.

⁶ Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness*, p. 284; *Cities in Revolt*, p. 174.

⁷ Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness*, pp. 447-448.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 123-26; 287.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 287; *Cities in Revolt*, p. 174.

after the Great Migration of the faithful began in 1630, the Massachusetts General Court set Harvard College on its distinguished road. Erecting and financing schools proved a difficult task (as did financing the college for that matter) and after a period in which private contributions were relied upon, the General Court of Massachusetts decided to compel towns to assume the burden.

Towns of at least 50 families, it decreed in 1647, must maintain a reading and writing master, and those of at least 100 families, a grammar master—as one who taught Latin and Greek was often called. Responsibility for enforcement of the law was placed with the county courts which were empowered to fine offending communities.¹⁰

With the exception of Rhode Island, the other New England colonies followed the Massachusetts example, though requirements and enforcement varied from one to another.

The statutes compelled local authorities to provide education; they did not force parents to send their children. Nor did the laws require communities to support their schools from taxes; finance was left entirely to the community's discretion.

Under the laws a pattern of control and finance appeared among New England villages. In its meeting—the most important institution of local government—the town handled the school in about the same way it did any public business. This was a fact of enormous importance, for, so located, the school could not avoid the impact of local politics and of public financial pressures.

Though the town meeting formulated school policy, it depended upon a committee (chosen in the meeting) or the selectmen (the most important officials chosen by the meeting) to carry it out. School committees and selectmen were usually the best men available—men who had education and political experience.

Committee functions varied little from town to town. Usually the committee hired the schoolmasters, found a place for the school to meet if a regular building was lacking, and handled the finances of the school. In most towns how the committee went about hiring a master was its own business, though it did have to satisfy the meeting. In Massachusetts a statute added another requirement: the local minister with one of his brethren, or any two neighboring ministers together, were supposed to approve the schoolmaster before he was hired. Though evidence

¹⁰ S. E. Morison, *The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England* (New York: New York University Press, 1956), pp. 65–78.

¹¹ This paragraph is based on an examination of manuscript court and town records.

¹² *Watertown Records*, 6 vols (Watertown: 1894–1906), II, 132.

¹³ *Records of Duxbury, Mass.* (Plymouth: 1893), p. 320.

is lacking, towns seems to have observed this statute. Only rarely did cases of noncompliance get into the county courts.¹¹

SCHOOL EXPENSES

As local taxes on polls and property provided most of the money for ordinary expenses, so also they provided school expenses. Only in Connecticut could towns look to the provincial government for consistent financial help. Connecticut towns received an annual contribution out of provincial taxes, but few, if any, found this subsidy large enough to meet the expenses of their schools.

In every New England colony, there were towns which could rely on public lands for part of their school expenses. Donated by individuals, or the colony, or set aside by the towns themselves, these lands could be rented or sold. Shrewdly invested, the income from such lands could often relieve the taxpayers of a large portion of school charges.

One other source of finance for schools existed—the parents of boys who attended. They could be assessed tuition for every child they sent to school and until the middle of the eighteenth century they occasionally were. In Watertown, Massachusetts, in 1700, for example, six pence a week was collected for each Latin scholar, four pence for a "writer," and three for a "reader."¹² Few towns required tuition payments but many insisted that parents provide firewood in the winter. Parents also purchased paper, pens and schoolbooks for their children.

Town growth intensified financial problems and created new difficulties. As its once compact population increased and spread out, a village saw its single school become inadequate. Far from the original settlement, children could not attend the once centrally located school. Nothing, of course, prevented a town from providing a second more accessible school—nothing except money. To soften the clamor for education that arose from remote areas, many towns decided to uproot their schools and send them out on the road. The school might "go round with the Sun" as it did in Duxbury, Massachusetts, for many years, meeting successively in the four quarters of the town for three months at a time.¹³

Putting the school on the move had the obvious
(Continued on page 307)

Robert Middlekauff served on the faculty at Yale before assuming a post at the University of California at Berkeley in 1962. A specialist in American colonial history, he is the author of *Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971) among other books. His article in this issue first appeared in *Current History*, July, 1961, in a symposium on Government and Education in the United States.

"By far the most important battle for free public schools in the United States was waged from about 1825 to 1850 in all the Northern states, the old Eastern and the new Western ones, to secure enough revenue to put public school systems on a going basis. . . . Proponents of free schools had to convince a majority of their fellow citizens to submit to direct taxation . . . for the support of schools."

The Rise of the Free Public School: American Education after 1800

BY WILLIAM G. CARLETON
Professor Emeritus of History, University of Florida

PROVISIONS FOR FORMAL EDUCATION in America in the period following the American Revolution were miscellaneous and inadequate. By 1800, there were 24 colleges in the United States, most of them denominational. But in that year, all told, these colleges probably did not have more than 100 faculty members, 1,500 students, or property worth one million dollars. Students, mostly from the upper classes, were prepared for these colleges by private tutors or in Latin grammar schools, which in New England still had some town support but elsewhere were privately conducted.

Those above the pauper classes, but not being prepared for college, got the rudiments of reading, writing, spelling and arithmetic, as well as religious and moral training, in their homes, in church schools and in private schools. Most of these private schools were "dame schools," that is, they were kept in a kitchen or living room by some woman who had picked up a little "book learning" and who undertook to instruct children in the neighborhood whose parents could afford to pay a few pennies a week for each child sent to her.

Most of the New England states, following the example of the Massachusetts legislation of 1647, required each town to maintain "a teacher of reading and writing." The towns obtained money for these schools from land endowments, license taxes, and rate-bills. But by the time of the Revolution, the decline of Puritan zeal had caused many of these town schools to fall into disuse, and in actual practice many New England communities had come to depend upon the dame schools.

What of the children of the masses, the children of the illiterate and the poor? Their parents could not teach them and could pay no church tithes or rate-

bills. Neither could they afford the few pennies a week for the dame school. Consequently, most public attention was concentrated on pauper education, for it was felt that the children of the poor should be rescued from "corruption, lewdness, and blasphemy."

Church tithes were set aside for the education of the poor, private subscription lists were circulated, philanthropic school societies were founded. The state, county and local governments obtained funds from land grants, lotteries and license taxes (particularly liquor taxes) to subsidize pauper children in church schools, private schools and dame schools, or to subsidize the separate pauper schools established by private subscription lists or philanthropic school societies. Sometimes a town or city would build a school building and let it rent free to a private schoolmaster on condition that he admit pauper children without charge. After 1800, towns and cities increasingly maintained public schools for pauper children. These were segregated schools, and only the children of the poor could attend.

In general, the educational practices just described represented some deterioration in the conditions which had prevailed prior to the Revolution. Indeed, in a number of ways education in all parts of the United States, including New England, worsened in the decades following the Revolution. The endowments and charities maintained by the Crown and by wealthy individual American Tories had been cut off by the Revolution. The benevolences and schools of the Anglican Church declined. Even before the Revolution, the increasing heterogeneity of the population and the decline of the old Puritan impulses to education had made it increasingly difficult to maintain the town elementary schools and the Latin grammar schools in the New England states. Overall, the

weakening of the old established churches—Anglican and Congregationalist—and the proliferation and increasing memberships of the dissenting sects, many of which had no church schools and little educational tradition, resulted in a decline in organized religious aid to elementary education. More and more Americans had come to live on the country's expanding and broadening frontiers or were living only a generation removed from frontier conditions, and as settlers plunged deeper into the interior they had less respect for learning and for European and Tidewater ways.

Why were Americans of the late eighteenth century and the early decades of the nineteenth century so little interested in maintaining formal educational institutions for their children? It must be remembered that as late as 1820 there were only 13 cities of 8,000 inhabitants or over in the whole country and that these "city" dwellers comprised only about five per cent of the country's population. The overwhelming majority of Americans lived on scattered farms and in isolated villages. Young people learned farming, livestock tending, meat-curing, food-preserving, sewing, rude carpentry, tool mending, hunting, trapping, and fishing from the older members of their family. In the towns and cities, one learned a craft or trade by being apprenticed at an early age to a master. Economic conditions, then, did not bring any widespread popular demands for education. The earlier religious urges to learn to read, in order to understand the Bible, were weaker than they had been as the population became more heterogeneous and more dispersed over America's amazingly growing back-country, and as the dissenting sects grew, with their emphasis on exhortation, evangelism, and camp meetings, rather than Bible-reading.

THE GREAT EDUCATIONAL AWAKENING, 1825

Beginning about 1825, a great educational awakening began in America, and during the following decades, particularly in the 1830's and the 1840's, decisive educational battles laid the firm foundations of America's system of free, tax-supported, democratic and non-sectarian schools.

What were the causes of this great awakening? Some were economic. The American economy was becoming less agrarian and more complex. Commerce and industry were expanding. Improvements in transportation and communications—more roads, the canals, and then the early railroads—were bringing communities closer together and stimulating the exchange of goods and services. The 13 cities of 1820 increased to 44 by 1840 and to 141 by 1860. The factory system was gradually superseding the domestic system of manufacturing. The apprentice system in the towns and cities was beginning to decline. The taxable wealth of American communities increased.

Some of the causes were political. The property

qualifications to vote and to hold office were being abolished in state after state. Political democracy and universal white male suffrage were coming to be the order of the day. This was the age of Jacksonian democracy, when more and more offices were thrown open to popular election and more and more voters were taking part in the elections. The idea grew that if the mass of people were to govern, then the mass of people must be educated.

Some of the causes could be found in the growing heterogeneity of the population and in the multiplication of religious sects. Immigrants continued to pour in from England, Scotland and Ulster, and in the 1840's came the great tides of German and Irish immigration. Would not the public schools be a means of uniting America's diverse populations and of giving them an understanding of American ways? Dissenting religious sects continued to proliferate in America itself, and European immigrants were bringing with them additional ones. Because of this widening religious pluralism, it was becoming increasingly clear that no religious denomination could be favored, that education in America, if it were to be supported financially by governments, would have to be non-sectarian.

Some of the causes were more specific and immediate. The steam printing press came into use in this period, and with it the first cheap modern newspapers. For obvious reasons, these newspapers favored increasing the number of people who could read, and they waged campaigns for public schools. As newspapers became more common, they stimulated the desire of individuals to learn to read. The methods of the Lancastrian school were being introduced into more and more localities in America, and under this system a teacher would teach his bright pupils the lesson for the morning, and then each of these pupils in turn would by rote teach a group of ten or twelve of his fellow pupils. By this method large numbers could be taught at relatively little cost. Although this system soon died out, it remained long enough for the advocates of free schools to convince much of the public that mass education at government expense would not be too costly.

During the 1830's and 1840's, leaders in the fight for public education were busy on scores of fronts. Their battle cry was: "The wealth of the state must be used to educate the children of the state." The two most influential leaders of the free school movement were Horace Mann in Massachusetts and Henry Barnard in Connecticut and Rhode Island.

OPPONENTS OF FREE SCHOOLS

However, it must not be supposed that the proponents of free schools had an easy time of it. Opponents fought them vigorously every step of the way. The forces ranged against free schools were led by the

aristocratic classes, the conservatives, the heavy tax-payers, and those who supported or had vested interests in the church and the private schools. Inertia, too, was on the side of the opposition.

Opponents of public schools asked many questions and used a variety of arguments. Was not education a private responsibility, and was it right that parents should be relieved of this responsibility by the state? Would not free schools rob citizens of their self-reliance? Was it fair to tax one to educate the children of another? Was it just that a person who had no children or few children should bear the expenses of a parent who had many children? Was it honest that the wealth of one community should be used to educate persons in another community? Was not this whole idea of public schools dangerously leveling doctrine, French revolutionary egalitarianism? Would not the state use the schools to indoctrinate? Would not pupils be forced to listen to teachings contrary to what they had learned at home? What about religious and moral instruction? Would not the public schools be godless schools? Could Americans afford the outlandish cost of public schools? Could politicians manage so big an undertaking and could they be trusted with such "huge" funds?

In spite of the formidable opposition, the proponents of public schools won, in large part because the deeper historical forces in America were operating in their favor.

Because the coming of political democracy was an important factor in the establishment of free schools, it is often assumed that it was the Jacksonian more than the Whig politicians who led the fight for public schools. This is erroneous. Very often the Jacksonian politicians who fought valiantly to extend the franchise took little or no part in the fight for public schools. In general, the liberal wing of the Whig party led by such men as William H. Seward and Thaddeus Stevens joined hands with the Van Buren-Locofoco liberal wing of the Democratic party in the battles to bring free schools to the Northern states. If any one group is to be singled out as being in the vanguard in the fight for public schools, it would be the transplanted New Englanders in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin. In terms of party politics, these transplanted New Englanders were Whigs more often than they were Democrats.

THE BATTLES FOR FREE SCHOOLS

Outside of New England, where the tradition of public support of town schools went back to the mid-seventeenth century, the entering wedge for public support of schools was the public aid given to paupers and to pauper schools. By the 1830's, because of the spread of democratic ideas, the pauper school system came increasingly under attack. It was said that this

system was a direct inheritance from English rule, belonged to a society based on classes, and was completely out of place in a republic founded on the doctrine that all men are created equal. It was also argued that to educate some of the children in church and private-pay schools and to segregate the poor in pauper schools, with the brand of pauper made plainly evident to them, would create a society of definite classes and endanger America's developing democratic institutions.

The fight to abolish the pauper school system and to establish public schools for all children came to a head in Pennsylvania in 1834 with the passage of the Free-School Law. This law created in every ward, township and borough in the state a public school district. Each district was ordered to vote on the acceptance or rejection of the law. Those accepting it were to organize free schools for all, while those rejecting the new law were to continue under the old Pauper-School Act. The fact that this new law was optional for each district shows that there was still much resistance to free schools. Some localities accepted the law and others rejected it. It was not until 1873 that the last school district of the state accepted the new system.

The fight against the pauper school system reached a climax in New Jersey in 1838, when the state instituted a partial system of free public schools. In 1844, the new constitution of New Jersey limited the income of the permanent school fund exclusively to the free public schools.

The victorious fights in Pennsylvania and New Jersey against the pauper school system virtually marked the end of that system in the North, for it was in these two states that the system had been most highly developed. However, the pauper school system lingered on in Maryland, Virginia, Georgia, and at various places in other Southern states until the educational reorganizations which took place following the Civil War.

The death of the pauper school system did not make American schools entirely free. In some of the New England states it had been traditional to use rate-bills as one device to get revenue for the town schools. As "free" schools spread in New York, it became a practice for some of the poorer school districts to rely on rate-bills to supplement their revenues. It also became a practice for the poorer districts in New York, and in some other states, to use rate-bills to get enough money to keep their new public schools going the three or four months required by state law to be eligible for state funds. These rate-bills were charges against the parent sending children to school. The charge per pupil was small, but it was enough to keep many poor children away from school.

The most bitter fight to abolish rate-bills took place in New York. In 1849, the New York Legislature

submitted to the voters the question whether rate-bills should be abolished and the public schools made completely free. The voters by a big majority endorsed the principle of entirely free schools, but the opposition was so intransigent that a second referendum was authorized in 1850. Proponents of entirely free schools won again, but not so decisively. Rate-bills were retained, but state appropriations for public schools were greatly increased, so that the number of districts which resorted to rate-bills sharply declined. It was not until 1867 that the state of New York abolished all rate-bills and made its schools entirely free. These fights in New York were widely publicized in some other states and helped them eliminate this vestige of undemocratic education.

The people of the new states west of the Appalachians had little sympathy for pauper school systems and rate-bills, and they were not encumbered by the undemocratic practices of the past. Every new state, beginning with Ohio in 1802, received from the federal government each sixteenth section of the public lands for the support of common schools, and two townships of land for the support of a state university. The older 16 states did not share in these grants, so most of them had to set about providing a permanent school fund of their own. Even in the new states the federal land grants were not adequate for the needs of public schools.

By far the most important battle for free public schools in the United States was waged from about 1825 to 1850 in all the Northern states, the old Eastern and the new Western ones, to secure enough revenue to put public school systems on a going basis. The old sources of school revenue—land grants, lotteries, license taxes—were plainly inadequate if all children were to be given free schooling. Proponents of free schools had to convince a majority of their fellow citizens to submit to direct taxation—state, county and local—for the support of schools.

Here and there, progressive communities had secured from the state legislatures permission to tax their residents directly for the support of schools, but now fights were waged to pass state laws which would compel the localities to tax directly for school purposes. When once the state itself was allowed to tax directly for school purposes, then it made its grants to localities for school aid contingent on the willingness of the localities to levy direct school taxes. A common prerequisite for the receiving of state aid was that the localities match state school funds with local funds. Other prerequisites were that the localities drop rate-bills and maintain a minimum school term, usually three or four months. With these devices for maintaining state supervision of the schools, most of the states established state boards of education or state superintendents of public instruction to enforce them.

In the first years of general state aid, some states distributed portions of the school funds among private and church schools, and even after more public schools were established, some state aid continued to go to church schools. In many Eastern states, church schools at first shared in the city funds. However, the question of whether this violated the principle of separation of church and state arose. As the heterogeneity of the population increased and with it the multiplication of religious sects, there were quarrels about what constituted a fair sharing of public money among the various church schools. Then, too, those denominations which had no church schools resented public funds being spent on church schools of other denominations. The question was made more acute by the large migrations of Irish Catholics and German Lutherans into the United States in the 1840's. In New York, in 1842, opposition of the Protestant churches to giving public funds to the Catholic schools resulted in cutting off public aid in that state to all church schools. This action by New York stimulated some other states to cut off public money to church schools. Thus conflicts among the churches themselves hastened the development of the non-sectarian public school system, and the public schools were left in exclusive possession of the school revenues.

As for secondary education, the decade from 1820 to 1830 saw the rapid development of the academy, which represented a transition from the old Latin grammar school to the American high school. The Latin grammar school took children at an early age and prepared them for college by concentrating on the ancient languages and the classics. The academy, unlike the Latin grammar school, did not run parallel to the lower grades but was built on top of them, thus helping to develop a one-ladder democratic system rather than a two-ladder class system. The academies also widened the curriculum to include algebra, astronomy, chemistry, botany, general history, American history, surveying, declamation and debating. Besides being forerunners of the high schools, the academies supplied the expanding public school systems with their best teachers. The academies were privately owned and students paid tuition,

(Continued on page 307)

William G. Carleton lectures frequently in colleges and universities around the country. He is the author of numerous articles in *Current History* and other publications and of *The Revolution in American Foreign Policy* (New York: Random House, new edition, 1967) and *Technology and Humanism: Some Exploratory Essays for our Times* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970). His article in this issue first appeared in *Current History*, July, 1961, in a symposium on Government and Education in the United States.

"In an examination of the growth of public education on all levels, this author writes that "far more remarkable than accumulated statistics was the altered spirit prevailing at all points in American education by 1914. In adjusting to the industrial and scientific, the social and intellectual revolution within the nation, the schools themselves were revolutionized."

The Changing Role of the American Public School, 1865-1914

BY ANN M. KEPPEL
Professor of Education, University of Hawaii

IN THE FIFTY YEARS between the Civil War and World War I, American education altered profoundly. This was a period of extended public support and, consequently, of remarkable growth in numbers of institutions and students. More important, schools and colleges assumed a multiplicity of tasks not previously considered within their domain. Paradoxically, although American public education surpassed that of any other nation in the world in scope and imagination, it was attacked as too narrow, too traditional, and inappropriate to the times.

In response to the varied demands of a complex, heterogeneous society, the schools and colleges hesitantly but certainly reflected the fundamental changes in the economic, social, and intellectual life of the nation. America refashioned its education and, in the process, produced schools and colleges vastly different from their pre-Civil War predecessors.

Between 1865 and 1914, the United States transformed itself from a nation primarily agrarian to one heavily industrial and highly urban. By 1890 the "frontier" had officially ended and, although more Americans still lived in rural than urban areas in 1914, the ratio was about to be reversed.¹ A new wave of immigration replaced the old. Southern Europeans swarmed to our shores to join a mobile native population concentrating in industrial centers. All were absorbed into a dramatically expanding economy.

Optimistic Americans had little doubt of the inevitability of progress as they exploited a rich supply

of natural resources, criss-crossed the country with an intricate transportation system, and built an industrial economy within an urban society. Relatively free of international crises and rapidly awakening to a position of world power, the United States enjoyed a period of economic growth and stability.

There were inevitable dislocations. Labor unrest accompanied the depressions of the 1870's and 1890's, and the beginnings of a labor organization with a sustained history emerged. Rural discontent led to the formation of the Grange, the Alliances, and ultimately to the politically significant though short-lived Populist party. At first, it seemed that even these dissident elements were accommodating themselves to *laissez faire* individualism. The American Federation of Labor moved cautiously within the established framework of the political and economic structure and the anguished cries of the farmers gradually subsided. Even the new immigrants—the Poles, the Russians, the Hungarians and the Italians—somehow made the painful transition to a new language, a new political structure, and an entirely new way of life.

But the voice of protest and reform was never silent. When, particularly after 1890, it appeared that the triumph of business, wedded to politics, stifled rather than released further individual opportunity, progressivism swept the country. Probing critics who found injustice and corruption demanded immediate and long-range reforms. By the first World War, the progressive movement was virtually over, but it had produced the muckrakers and social settlement workers, a Theodore Roosevelt and a Robert La Follette, and an array of municipal, state and federal laws touching the lives of all Americans.

For American schools it was an equally exciting span of years. By any established criteria, schools grew in number and influence. The 37 per cent of

¹ *Twelfth Census of the United States: 1900, Statistical Atlas* (Washington: United States Census Bureau, 1903), p. 40 states, "While the aggregate population has increased rapidly from census to census, the urban element has increased proportionately much faster than the aggregate population." By 1920, more people were officially living in urban than rural areas according to *Fourteenth Census of the United States, Statistical Abstract, 1920* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1923), pp. 74, 86.

children from ages five through 17 who attended school in 1870 increased to 55 per cent in 1914. The annual expenditure per child rose and schools were in session more days per year in both rural and urban regions. The average monthly salary of teachers, still sadly low, nonetheless soared from a mere \$16.60 in 1870 to \$46.50 in 1914. A declining illiteracy rate of 20 per cent of the population in 1870 to 6 per cent in 1920 demonstrated the basic accomplishment of our schools. The number of colleges doubled with the result that more students graduated from college in 1914 than had completed high school in 1870. Formal education profited from America's growing wealth.

Although the principle of free, non-sectarian, publicly supported schools for all was so deeply embedded as not to be revoked, no organized *system* of education existed in 1865. Even in states where the common schools were free and numerous and where the statutes provided for a state university, the status of the high school—the logical link between them—was precarious. Initially, a variety of private and semi-public academies, seminaries of learning, and scattered public high schools feebly filled the gap. By the end of the era, however, the high school, supported and controlled by the public, had come of age.

EMERGENCE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL

The trend, particularly after 1870, was for state legislatures to authorize districts to establish high schools, to encourage them with financial aid and, finally, to require the more densely populated towns and cities to provide them. Formal schooling was not only directly available to more students for more years, it was obligatory as well. In 1890, compulsory attendance laws in 31 states and territories required children, usually from ages 8 through 14, to attend school a certain specified number of days per year. Progress, sporadic and uneven across the nation and dependent upon the interest of the particular state, was so great that by 1914 the United States Commissioner of Education was prompted to call the small high school "one of the monuments to the American belief in education, beautiful, if often blind."

Local communities, prodded into action and aided financially by the state, built an educational system. A variety of attempts to extend federal aid to general education went down to defeat and no national policy therefore prevailed. Only later, in 1917, did Congress give funds for secondary education and this to the special areas of agriculture, home economics and the industrial arts in the form of the Smith-Hughes Act.²

In 1867, however, the United States established the Department of Education (later demoted to an Office) headed by a commissioner who made avail-

able information about our own and foreign schools. If the titular leader of education for the nation only gathered statistics and advised, the role of each state's chief education officer was strengthened by law. By the end of the period, he examined teachers for certification, offered suggestions for the curriculum, and helped to determine standards for new buildings.

The South lagged. Not until the very end of the century did the Southern states begin to move in the direction in which the rest of the nation had already made great strides. The Reconstruction period held high hopes. The federally supported Freedman's Bureau built and operated schools; the reconstructed Southern states all accepted the *principle* of public support in their new constitutions; the Peabody and Slater funds encouraged teacher education and public aid. But the burden of a dual system for Negroes and whites, a distinctive pattern by 1890 and endorsed by the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision (163 U.S. 537 [1896]), only exaggerated a problem of traditional public indifference.

An educational revival after 1900, spearheaded by enlightened Southern leadership and supported by philanthropic funds, stimulated public support. Nonetheless, although the *rate* of progress in the area was greater than in any other section of the nation from 1900 to 1914, the South, still predominantly rural and relatively poor, fared badly.

Far more remarkable than accumulated statistics was the altered spirit prevailing at all points in American education by 1914. In adjusting to the industrial, scientific, social and intellectual revolution within the nation, the schools themselves were revolutionized. Beginning in the colleges in the late 1880's and increasing in tempo and scope throughout education after 1890, thoughtful and imaginative probings into the nature of the individual and the nature of society raised provocative questions about the objectives of formal education in the United States.

THE SCHOOLS' NEW ROLE

The public schools could not long ignore the problems attendant upon the rapid urbanization and industrialization which so sorely tried the old ties of home and community. A new role was forced upon them. More of a social necessity than ever before, the schools filled a vacuum created by the inability or slowness of other institutions to ease the shock of adjustment to a new life. The school, for example, was once again the chief agency for Americanizing a far more heterogeneous population than we had ever had. Where but in the schools, it was argued, could the immigrant's child learn not only the language needed for basic studies, but also citizenship within a democracy, good health habits, and the skills needed to succeed in a machine age? In the country, rural spokesmen, aware of urban problems out of a con-

² See discussion below.

cern for the abandonment of the farm for the city, viewed the school as the only possible agency to inculcate agrarian values, improve farming and, hopefully, stop the drift to town.

Whole new bodies of scientific and technological knowledge promised even greater progress and where but in the schools and colleges could this be best disseminated? Was it not appropriate for the schools to make the transition easier for the vast majority of students who went directly into industry, commerce or agriculture? The schools belonged to the people, it was contended, and they should therefore be responsive to public demand.

From urban and rural critics came the cry that the schools and colleges were aristocratic, undemocratic and patterned on wornout medieval models. In answer, the elementary school, the high school and the college added frankly vocational courses. Advocates of curriculum change found their arguments buttressed by the work of psychology. Conventional conceptions of the importance of mental discipline and transfer of training, to which defenders of tradition looked for support, were undermined by empirical evidence of the functionalists and connectionists who offered alternative theories on how we learn. By the end of the era, research into individual differences in human intelligence and aptitude raised a further question on the appropriateness of a required course of subjects, each with intrinsic value.

Finally, romantic theories of the child, imported from Europe, found adherents for a child-centered school which would revolve around the needs and interests of active, growing children. Late in the century, these, too, were reinforced by empirical research. A host of evidence provided by the child-study movement, led by G. Stanley Hall, implied that adults would do well to heed, and not interfere with, the natural development of children. All served to provide new bases for evaluating formal education.

RISE OF STATE UNIVERSITIES

The most perceptible changes came first in higher education, both private and public. The rise of the state universities—neither wholly state supported nor truly universities before 1865—served to democratize the college by offering practical education. Federal aid given in the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 encouraged state subsidies which, in turn, encouraged a broadening of the curriculum and constituency already under way.

³ Harvard's president noted five-sixths of the colleges in the United States maintaining preparatory departments in 1890. Charles William Eliot, *Educational Reform, Essays and Addresses* (New York: The Century Company, 1898), p. 198.

⁴ Report of the Committee on Secondary Studies of the National Education Association, 1893, United States Bureau of Education #205 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895), pp. 51-52.

With the expansion of the college and growth of the high school, there was disturbing confusion over the role of each. How could a unified system be hammered out of the disparate parts? Who was to decide the appointed task of the public high school? For a time, it appeared that the college would make the decision. Each college had always had its entrance examinations and between 1870 and 1900, high schools met new requirements of modern history and languages, geography and the sciences. When the individual efforts of individual institutions proved inadequate, regional organizations sought to bring order out of chaos. The New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, formed in 1885, was followed by a similar organization in the middle Atlantic states in 1892 and in the Midwest in 1894. Outside the East, where the state gave substantial support to a university or college system, statewide plans were adopted. Michigan's solution, widely adopted by 1900, was to send university staff members to inspect high schools of the state, thus permitting students from approved schools to proceed automatically to the university.

The lack of coordination pleased no one. Despite attempts to define the task of the high school, colleges found it necessary to offer the equivalent of a secondary education. As late as 1890, for instance, almost as many students were enrolled in college preparatory departments as in collegiate departments in our institutions of higher learning.³ The colleges were unhappy with their dual role and the high schools complained of dominance by college authorities who appeared to be unaware of the monumental task involved in educating everyone. The questions remained: How could the high schools best serve the needs of most students? Was the task of the high school to prepare students for college or to give them an adequate terminal education?

GOALS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL

Two committees of the National Education Association, one in 1893 and the other in 1918, dramatized the radical change in the avowed purpose of secondary education. The 1893 Committee of Ten, headed by Harvard's President Eliot, declared the "main function" of the high school that of preparing students, not for college, but "for the duties of life." What did this mean? To this committee, which adhered to the theories of mental discipline already under fire, it meant that the school should offer a hard core of subjects, all of equal value, "to be taught consecutively and thoroughly" for the purpose of "training the powers of observation, memory, expression and reasoning. . . ."⁴ The job of the high school, the committee suggested, was to cultivate the intellectual abilities of all students, regardless of their background, aspirations, or abilities.

By 1918, when the N.E.A.'s Committee on Reorganization of the Secondary Schools issued its famous seven cardinal principles, the whole purpose of secondary education was redefined. Only one of the principles—command of the fundamental processes—was clearly designed for intellectual development. The others—citizenship, worthy home membership, vocational efficiency, worthy use of leisure time, ethical character and health—offered far broader goals to guide the high school. While not abandoning its initial aim, the public high school expanded its function in American society.

The new official ideology was only a recognition of already established fact. In the high school, an explosion of the curriculum within the comprehensive high school had produced a revolution fully as profound as that in higher education. By 1914, it was possible to earn high school credit for subjects ranging from "Roman customs and institutions to tinsmithing," from the traditional Greek and Latin to band and orchestra.⁵ Early clashes among labor, management and educators over manual training led, in several of the larger cities, to the establishment of distinctly technical schools. But vocationally-oriented separate schools were in the minority. Firm in its commitment to universal education, the United States was reluctant to divide students into laboring and non-laboring classes. More characteristically American was the all-inclusive high school where students could elect from a widening range of curricula, each of which led to a diploma. Diversity within uniformity prevailed.

Utilitarian courses in machine shop, carpentry, electricity as well as specialized subjects in agriculture and home economics were added to already existing courses. Commercial courses, long offered at the secondary level, expanded their domain. Even the traditional academic offerings appeared in new garb. The ancient languages and history lost priority to modern languages and American history; civics replaced political economy and civil government; above all, the sciences flourished. According to one detailed study of the period, the only subject universally required of all high school students in 1910 was English composition, into which the former grammar and rhetoric had been incorporated.⁶

In elementary education, widely available to all

⁵ *Report of the United States Commissioner of Education*, 1914, 1: 127.

⁶ John Elbert Stout, *The Development of High School Curricula in the North Central States from 1860 to 1918* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921), especially pages 147-223.

⁷ Ned Harlan Dearborn, *The Oswego Movement in American Education* (New York: Columbia Teachers College, 1925).

⁸ Lawrence A. Cremin, "The Progressive Movement in American Education: A Perspective," *Harvard Educational Review*, v. 27, #4, Fall, 1957, pp. 251-270.

⁹ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916), p. 395.

youth, fresh, exciting experiments were rare before 1900. The three R's dominated by the formal recitation and routine memorization formed the substance of the curriculum. Attempts to translate theories of various European educators for America met with varying successes. In the 1870's, the "Object Method" of Edward P. Sheldon at Oswego, New York, Normal School, launched a wave of Pestalozzianism in the United States.⁷

The kindergarten, based on Friedrich Froebel's mystical view of the importance of play in human development, became a part of the St. Louis, Missouri, school system in 1873; by 1898, 189 cities supported public kindergartens in which teachers supervised the games and socialization of active children. Finally, Herbartian psychology, brought from Germany in the 1880's, exalted the role of the teacher in forming character and stressed the importance of literature and history. While these were all regarded by skeptics as passing fads, they made an important break with tradition and opened the way for wide experimentation and an altered view of the child in the classroom.

"PROGRESSIVE" EDUCATION

By World War I, a host of "progressives" in education exalted a new approach to the child and a new conception of the role of the school in American society. Contemporary with, and a part of, the larger political and social progressive movement, devoted reformers entertained a vision of a new society in which the schools would play a crucial role.⁸ The best known spokesman for "progressive education" was, of course, John Dewey. From 1896 to 1904, at the Chicago experimental school, Dewey sought closer correlations between traditionally separated theory and practice, the child and his curriculum, and the society and the school of which it was a part.⁹

Dewey was neither the earliest of critics offering suggestions to teachers nor was he the most antagonistic to the existing educational order. As early as the 1870's, Francis W. Parker (referred to by Dewey as the father of progressive education) made world-renowned the Quincy, Massachusetts, public schools. Here, children startled visitors by actually learning more through an activity-oriented school than through traditional formal methods. At the turn of the century in the Laboratory School attached to Cook County Normal in Illinois (eventually absorbed into the University of Chicago), Parker and his devoted staff broke down barriers between subjects, eased rela-

(Continued on page 308)

Ann M. Keppel taught at the University of Vermont before joining the faculty at the University of Hawaii. Her article in this issue first appeared in *Current History*, July, 1961, in a symposium on Government and Education in the United States.

Under the pressure of World War II, "the federal government expanded its education activities . . . and made way for the more widespread participation . . . which was to follow in the postwar years."

Growing Federal Involvement in American Education, 1918-1945

BY HARRY V. BARNARD
Professor of Education, University of Kentucky

JOHN H. BEST
Professor of Education, Georgia State University

TIMES OF CRISIS in the United States during the years from 1918 to 1945 appear to have led to gradual federal involvement in American education. The period of stress of the First World War produced national legislation directed toward aiding several specific programs in secondary education, programs which were expanded, within limited scope, during the relatively placid period of the 1920's. The national emergency created by the Great Depression brought about massive efforts to restore economic equilibrium through legislative action on the part of the federal government. This legislation affected virtually every level of public education.

A commission of the National Education Association in 1918 stated a set of aims for education, the *Seven Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, which summed up in concise form the directions of the new emphases in education. These aims, which found broad support in the 1920's from America's educational leadership, were the following: command of fundamental processes; health; worthy home membership; vocational efficiency; civic participation; worthy use of leisure time; and ethical character. Above all, the implication of the *Seven Cardinal Principles* was that the American high school should accept responsibility for the education of all American youth and no longer just that group which would continue from high school to college.

Developments in practice in American schools during the 1920's reflected in some aspects the research and the stated aims of education for the period. The junior high school movement which originated in the decade was influenced in large part by the effort to free children for a longer period of time from the pressures of college preparation, to allow the student more time for exploratory studies, as well as to permit a smoother transition for the individual from elementary to secondary school.

Practices in general in American schools, however, exhibited little striking change or development. Progressive methods and techniques in education were much discussed but rarely implemented. A shift of orientation in secondary schools toward the ideas stated in the *Seven Cardinal Principles* was slow and faltering. Methods and practices in the schools of the United States remained to a wide degree "traditional," much as they had been at the beginning of the century.

Enrollments continued to rise in the decade of the 1920's, in part a result of the wartime birth boom, but mainly because more young people were continuing in schools for a longer time. And with the rising enrollments and general economic prosperity of the period, school construction boomed, with junior high schools as well as elementary and secondary school buildings—most of them in the grade school gothic style still evident today in any American town.

Expansion of school construction and rising enrollments, though strong in the cities, were not so evident in rural America. The prosperity of the 1920's had never quite touched the farmer, and one evidence of his plight was the generally limited educational facilities in rural communities; throughout the nation the one-room schoolhouse still remained in many of these areas. Some efforts were made to expand and improve the program of the rural school, efforts which usually grew out of the magnified agricultural interests of the First World War. In general, however, education in rural America was left out of the expansion of the 1920's.

The major portion of federal educational activity during this era as would be expected was in the field of agricultural and vocational education. Though since 1862 the federal government had supported agricultural and industrial education at the college

level, the Federal Vocational Education Act of 1917, commonly referred to as the Smith-Hughes Act, was the first effort to extend aid to schools below the college level. The act was to train students 14 years of age or older by

... cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors and directors of agricultural subjects, and teachers of trade, home economics and industrial subjects and in the preparation of teachers. . . .¹

From the very beginning it was emphasized that the Smith-Hughes Act was designed to meet *local* needs and that the programs instituted under the act were to be controlled by local educational authorities. The federal government assisted the local communities in studying their problems and in developing effective and up-to-date courses, yet made no attempt to dictate to them.

In 1918, after only one year of operation, the appropriations for this program were increased by \$700,000 to a total of \$2.4 million. Appropriations continued to increase and by the academic year 1932-1933 almost \$10 million was being appropriated annually.

With the increased appropriations, which had to be matched dollar-for-dollar by the states, the schools were making great strides toward providing vocational training for that 85 per cent of the youngsters who had previously left high school with no salable skills. The new program, as one member of Congress predicted, was helping to "... make it possible for every boy and girl to go out into the world equipped for the practical training for life's work."

In addition to aiding vocational and agricultural education directly, the appropriations under the Smith-Hughes Act and subsequent vocational educational legislation indirectly aided *all* education. With the direct assistance provided by the federal government for the development of vocational education programs, the states and localities could devote more of their own money and efforts to other educational endeavors. So successful was the federal aid to vocational education programs that it was extended and expanded in 1929 by the George-Reed Act and in 1936 by the George-Ellzey Act.

With the exception of aid to vocational education and the limited educational opportunities provided for disabled veterans of World War I under the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1918, the federal government maintained a general policy of *laissez faire* during the 1920's.

TIME OF DESPAIR

The economic chaos attending the stock market

"crash" of 1929 and the Great Depression, which continued through the decade of the 1930's, shattered the complacency of peace and prosperity which had characterized America since the First World War. This time of despair, of disillusion, was described by John W. Studebaker, the United States Commissioner of Education in 1935, in these remarks:

On every hand it is said that we have become the slaves of the machines we have built. Our capacity to produce the material basis for an abundant life has far exceeded our ability to control and direct the huge powers of a machine age. We are indeed living today in a most paradoxical world.

People are idle, we are told, because they produce too much. They are feverishly preparing for more ghastly wars, and yet they hate and fear war. They are not well fed, and yet they destroy food. They are poorly clothed, and yet they plow under cotton and run their marvelous textile mills at less than half their capacity. They lack proper educational facilities for their children because of vast curtailments of opportunity and no proper expansion, and yet they have thousands of trained teachers ready and eager to educate.²

EDUCATION IN CRISIS

Theory in education during the depression decade was vitally concerned with the social role of the school in the midst of the economic crisis in American society. A statement of aims of education, entitled *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy*, was formulated in 1938 by the N.E.A.'s Educational Policies Commission. In general this statement was a reaffirmation of the Seven Cardinal Principles of two decades earlier with, however, a perceptible shift of emphasis toward the responsibilities of education to society.

The statement in the *Purposes* clearly enunciated the principle that the school must meet an obligation to *all* youth. Technological and industrial development in America by the decade of the 1930's had placed on the school a burden greater than ever before to give training and background to equip workers to meet the demands of this increasingly industrial society.

The aims of education were clearly stated, yet the reality of these aims fell far short. School construction, rather than keeping pace with the rise in enrollments, was generally curtailed under the economic stress of the times. Many communities shortened the school term, and many others in fact closed schools entirely. Programs and curricula which might have benefited that segment of the school population who would not continue into college were dropped or cut back or were never begun, again because of lack of financial support.

In surveying the state of education at the secondary level in 1934, E. W. Butterfield, then Commissioner of Education in Connecticut, pointed out the change in social and economic makeup of at least half of the

¹ *The Congressional Record*, January 9, 1917.

² John W. Studebaker, "Liberalism and Adult Civic Education," *School and Society*, XLII (October 12, 1935), p. 489.

high school population, a group which had not been present in the secondary schools of 1900. This group he termed "The New Fifty Per Cent."³ In an essay, much discussed and quoted at the time, Butterfield pointed out the needs of this new group, which differed considerably from the former college preparatory makeup of the high school. From this writing and from efforts by many other educators came the beginning of programs and curricula adjusted to the demands of all youth in secondary schools.

FEDERAL AID IN THE DEPRESSION

Yet the schools of the 1930's were still making only a beginning toward fitting American education for all youth. It appeared that American schools were so far from achieving this goal, in fact were so far out of touch with the masses of young Americans during the early depression years, that federal funds toward educating and benefiting these youth could perhaps not rightfully go to American schools. Rather, those young people who most needed the emergency aid during the depression years were not to be found in schools. Hence, the federal efforts to return young men and women to schools. Hence, the federal programs creating whole organizations outside the bounds of public education yet paralleling many of its functions. Hence, the N.Y.A., the C.C.C. and adult education programs of many types and varieties.

During President Franklin Roosevelt's "first one hundred days" the Congress had enacted legislation providing for the establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Corps provided employment, sustenance, clothing, and what was planned to be a wholesome environment for jobless young men between the ages of 18 and 25 who enrolled voluntarily for six-month terms. Enlistees came rapidly and, at the heights of the Corps' development, filled over 2,600 residence camps. The maximum enrollment of 300,000 was maintained at full strength most of the time by reenlistments and new enrollees.

The initial purposes of providing remunerative employment to destitute young men and of conserving natural resources in national parks and national forests were extended soon after the establishment of the C.C.C. Both formal and informal educational programs were developed; during the almost ten years of the Corps' existence, approximately 90 per cent of the more than three million enrollees took part in some type of education activity. In addition to the hundreds of thousands who received vocational training, over 100,000 were taught to read and write, over 25,000 were graduated from the eighth grade and over 5,000 from high school. A total of almost \$3.

³ E. W. Butterfield, "The New Fifty Per Cent," *Junior-Senior High School Clearing House*, VIII (January, 1934), pp. 265-272.

⁴ P. Allen Hollis, *The Federal Government and Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950), p. 94.

billion was spent on the C.C.C. between 1933 and 1941.⁴

Another anti-depression measure providing aid to education was the National Youth Administration, which was organized under the Works Progress Administration in 1935. A total of more than one million high school and college students received aid from the N.Y.A. and its predecessor, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. The N.Y.A., like the C.C.C., was abandoned during the early months of the Second World War.

During the depression years, the federal government also aided education through the Public Works Administration by providing loans for the construction of school buildings. The W.P.A. provided a panorama of educational activities for children and adults, enrolling in a peak month as many as 1.5 million persons in adult education and almost 50,000 in nursery schools.

Federal action in education was aimed primarily not at supporting the public education system in its aim of educating all American youth, but more urgently, at programs which would relieve some of the immediate economic stress of the depression. The legislation passed by Congress in the area of education, and in these quasi-educational efforts, was clearly forced by the economic crisis of the times.

During the years of the Second World War American educational philosophy changed relatively little. The international crisis of the war replaced the domestic crisis of the depression years. The N.E.A.'s Educational Policies Commission took up the question of aims of education once again, and in 1944 issued a statement, *Education for All American Youth*, which was essentially a reformulation of the basic aims stated in the preceding decades. The stress of the depression on American education was exchanged for the pressures of the war, the shortage of teachers, the lack of materials for school construction and the generally resulting limitations on school programs. Again, the federal government moved to meet the immediate crisis in education.

(Continued on page 308)

Harry V. Barnard has taught at Rutgers University Graduate School of Education and served as Clerk of the Subcommittee on Special Education of the U.S. House of Representatives.

John Hardin Best taught at Rutgers University and is now Chairman of the Educational Foundation at Georgia State University. He is, with Robert Sidwell, the editor of *American Legacy of Learning: Readings in the History of Education* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1967). Their article in this issue first appeared in *Current History*, July, 1961, in a symposium on Government and Education in the United States.

"On balance . . . it seems safe to assume that the rate of shift of financial responsibility for schools from local to state levels will increase. Further, it is probable that at least a significant portion of any added revenues for schools will come from sources other than local property taxes. . . . The political decisions that must be made to affect these basic changes in tax structure and burden will certainly create a storm in state legislatures across the country."

State and Local Efforts to Finance Schools Since 1945

BY PETER D. VEILLETTÉ

Staff Associate, Research Division, National Education Association

AMERICA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS in 1945 were to a great extent the product of the social and political events of the preceding 15 years. The economic depression, followed by World War II, dealt a severe blow to the school systems of every state. Both these tragic events had a direct and immediate effect upon the availability of resources for education, and consequently altered traditional patterns of state and local support for public schools.*

The depression of the 1930's struck at the very basis of public school support—the property tax. With economic activity at a low point, the demand for real estate dropped off sharply, resulting in a general decline in property values. This condition brought increasing property assessments to a halt at a time when many states had constitutional or statutory property tax rate limits in force. In addition to cutting off the flow of revenue for current expenditures, these events indirectly restricted capital outlay because local debt limits were calculated at a per cent of either assessed valuation or total tax levy.

Even without legal limits, property tax collections would have declined as a result of increased tax delinquency. At a time when 63 per cent of all local

school expenditures were being financed by property taxes, the reduction in revenue resulted in a crisis. Services were curtailed, payrolls cut, and in some instances schools were closed. The property tax would not emerge again as a viable revenue source for schools until after World War II. As late as 1945, property taxes took the smallest portion of national income, 3.0 per cent, that they had in any year since 1902.¹

World War II struck at the core of the nation's schools—the teaching profession. When business activity increased to meet war production needs, higher salaries in defense-related industries attracted thousands of teachers away from the profession. During the war years, an estimated 70,000 teachers left the schools for positions in industry. An equal number left teaching for military service.² Smaller rural school districts were particularly hard hit. To the extent that it was possible, larger cities raised salaries and attracted qualified teachers from these areas. The resulting shortage necessitated hiring underqualified teachers. By 1945, 120,000 teachers with emergency teaching certificates were employed in the schools. Even so, schools were forced to reduce curriculums; 50,000 positions were eliminated.³

Salaries still remained low for a large number of teachers. Out of a total supply of 868,900 teachers in 1945, approximately 50 per cent were earning annual salaries of less than \$2,000, and 20 per cent were earning less than \$1,200.⁴ The minimum annual salary paid to professional employees by the federal government at that time was \$2,000.

Local school construction during the depression came to a virtual halt. Schools that were built in those years were usually constructed under the federal Works Progress Administration program. This moratorium was continued throughout World War II be-

* Except as otherwise noted, financial information in this article was taken from *Estimates of School Statistics*, published annually by the National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

¹ Warren E. Gauerke and Jack R. Childress, eds., *The Theory and Practice of School Finance* (Chicago: National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, 1967), p. 134.

² National Education Association, *Personnel Problems in Public Education, 1944-45* (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1944), p. 5.

³ National Education Association, *Advance Estimates of Public Elementary Schools for the School Year 1947-48* (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1947), p. 1.

⁴ National Education Association, *Personnel Problems in Public Education, 1944-45* (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1944), pp. 3-4.

cause of the priority of defense activities. Capital budgets for schools, which had dropped to a mere 3.4 per cent of expenditures in 1933-1934, were reduced to 2.2 per cent by 1943-1944. The brief increase in construction in the late 1930's had only begun to compensate for the neglected needs that had accumulated. The balance had to be carried forward until after the war.

FORCES AFFECTING SCHOOL FINANCE

The financing of public schools since 1945 has been influenced by major trends both within and outside the schools. Several of these trends have had a continuing impact on school finance for more than one-half of the elapsed years since World War II. School district consolidation is one such trend. In 1945, there were 101,382 school districts in the United States. By 1971, this number had been reduced to 17,218 through consolidations and closings. The years of maximum activity for this consolidation occurred from 1948 through 1970. During that time, the number of school districts was reduced at an average rate of 3,116 per year.

In the years immediately following World War II, the loss of teachers to the cities and the general migration of persons to metropolitan areas forced the closing of many rural districts. In more recent years, consolidation has become necessary because these districts are at a disadvantage in financing education due to their small tax base and their inability to take advantage of the economies of scale. This problem is further aggravated by the need for an expanded educational program.

A second major trend affecting educational finance has been the urbanization of the American population. From 1950 to 1970, the number of persons living in urban areas increased from 64.0 to 73.5 per cent of the total population. Even more significant has been the rapid growth of suburban areas around central cities. The percentage of persons living in these areas rose from 13.8 in 1950, to 21.2 in 1960, to 26.8 in 1970.⁵ Indications are that the period of greatest shift in the population ended about 1966. This shift of population contributed to a school building boom and a realignment of power within state legislatures, resulting in changes in expenditure patterns for education. A study of twelve metropolitan areas by the Civil Rights Commission found that in ten of the twelve areas, central cities spent more per pupil than

⁵ U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1971* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 16.

⁶ New York Times Company, *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: New York Times Co., 1968), p. 435.

⁷ U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Digest of Educational Statistics, 1970 Edition* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 49.

did the suburbs in 1950. However, by 1964, in seven of the areas, the average suburb spent more dollars per pupil.⁶

Enrollment increases constitute the third long-term trend since 1945. Total enrollment went from 23,300,000 in 1945 to 46,168,000 in 1971. The greatest increases came between 1951 and 1965 when the growth rate averaged over 1,000,000 per year. This tremendous growth was caused by the coincidence of two factors—a rapid rise in the number of school-age children, and a greatly increased retention rate of students through high school. For every 100 persons aged 17 in 1945, 47.9 graduated from high school. In successive years this rate increased to 59.0 in 1949, 65.1 in 1959, and 78.4 in 1968.⁷ In addition, education was expanding at the other end of the scale. Kindergartens were available to 74.4 per cent of the population in 1950, and 89.5 per cent in 1970. These increases put continuous pressure on school budgets both in terms of current expenditures for increased staffing, and capital expenditures for new school construction. Many schools were unable to meet this demand and were forced to turn to double sessions as a temporary solution.

Increases in the instructional staff, the fourth major trend, followed closely the expansion of enrollment. Total instructional staff members increased from 868,900 in 1945 to 2,328,300 in 1971. For 16 years, from 1953 to 1968, the instructional staff, including teachers, librarians, guidance personnel and so on, grew at a rate of 66,275 per year. It was during these years that schools were called upon to hire better qualified teachers, expand curriculums and increase teachers' salaries to become more competitive with other occupations. Consequently, the average annual instructional salary increased from \$3,825 in 1953 to \$9,689 in 1970. Because these salaries account for approximately 75 per cent of current educational expenditures, the combined effect of salary increases and a greatly expanded instructional staff accounted for the major portion of expenditure increases in local school budgets.

Court-ordered integration of the public schools constitutes the fifth long-term trend. The Supreme Court's historic 1954 decision in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education* (347 U.S. 483) set in motion a chain of events leading to today's school busing controversy. At each step along the way—closing dual school systems, integrating all white schools and cross-busing students—budgets were adjusted to accommodate these requirements. Identifiable costs are difficult to estimate because they have been absorbed within pre-existing budgetary accounts. Undoubtedly, the most dramatic increase in expenditures would result from equalizing expenditures among schools in cases where city and suburban school districts are ordered to merge into a single system.

The sixth trend affecting public school finance was construction activity conducted between 1955 and 1969. During this 15-year period, 1,044,500 new classrooms were opened.⁸ Capital budgets rose rapidly from their low of 3.8 per cent of expenditures in 1945 to 20.2 per cent in 1950. For the following ten years they remained at or above this level. It was not until 1960 that capital expenditures began to take a smaller portion of budgeted funds. Since then they have declined to an estimated 9.6 per cent for 1971—a level that had not been seen since 1947.

A seventh major factor affecting school finance has been curriculum development and expansion. Until the late 1950's, schools had been concerned with the preparation of students along one of three traditional curriculums: academic, vocational or general. Then, with the launching of the Soviet sputnik in 1957, curriculum development and expansion became a significant factor in school finance. The following years witnessed a drive to enroll more students in math, science and language courses. Emphasis was placed on preparation for life in a technological world in which a "knowledge explosion" was occurring. In the mid-1960's, curriculum development turned in another direction. More emphasis was placed on the arts, the humanities and social and cultural development—a different kind of preparation for life in a technological world. Along with this trend has been a greater concern with special education for persons with learning difficulties. At each step, additional teachers, texts and learning facilities added to the overall cost of elementary and secondary education.

A final trend, developing in recent years, is the application of technology to teaching. Beginning in about 1965 and continuing to the present, the introduction of modern technology to classroom situations has been increasing at a moderate rate. Computer-based instruction, language labs, television and other techniques are becoming more accepted by educators, not as a substitute for traditional classroom methods, but as an aid to expand learning opportunities. A survey in 1955 found that among the available teaching aids, only films and tape recorders were used by 50 per cent of the schools polled. By 1965, all the above mentioned technologies had been adopted by over 65 per cent of the school systems.⁹ However,

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

⁹ Committee for Economic Development, *The Schools and the Challenge of Innovation* (New York: The Committee, 1969), p. 136.

¹⁰ President's Commission on School Finance, *Progress Report* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 46.

¹¹ Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *State and Local Finances, Significant Features 1967-1970* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 70.

¹² U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Public School Finance Programs, 1968-69* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), pp. 1-329.

the President's Commission on School Finance reported that less than 5 per cent of the 1.25 billion hours of instruction per week make use of these devices.¹⁰ The direction that these technological innovations will take in the future is uncertain. It seems unlikely that they will reduce school costs.

LOCAL FINANCE

In terms of dollars, the response to increased educational needs has been remarkable. Overall revenues for public schools increased from \$3.059 billion in 1945 to \$46.645 billion in 1971. By far the largest amount of these funds has come from local sources. In 1945, the local portion of total revenues was 63.9 per cent, and in 1971 the local share was still high at 52.0 per cent. On the expenditure side, this permitted an increase from \$136 to \$929 per pupil annually in daily attendance. Even with this dramatic increase, needs are still unmet, and central city school systems suffer from a lack of financial resources. For the 1966-1967 school year, suburbs of the 37 largest metropolitan areas spent an average of \$143 per capita of the general population for education. In the central cities, however, the average was \$111 per capita.¹¹

As disparities like this are discovered, people look back and try to determine where the system has gone wrong. For a time following World War II, it was generally believed that non-property taxes would provide the revenue needed to upgrade and maintain a high quality educational system. Until that time, few localities had given non-property taxes serious consideration. A breakthrough occurred in Pennsylvania in 1947 with the passage of legislation allowing local governments to levy any tax not levied by the state. Other states soon followed the lead. Cities, counties and school districts began to tax sales, income, utilities, admissions, hotel rooms and so on. For the most part, the taxes were not so productive as had been anticipated. High administrative costs, overlapping jurisdictions and tax competition all reduced their value. Today, less than 15 per cent of local non-property taxes are levied by school districts. Such taxes are primarily the domain of cities and counties. Following this unsuccessful attempt to raise revenues, school districts looked to the states for increased aid and worked at improving the property tax.

The story of the property tax is a large part of the story of local efforts to finance education. In 1968-1969, 41 states reported that more than 75 per cent of their locally raised revenue for schools came from property taxes. Of this number, 32 states reported that property taxes accounted for over 90 per cent of such revenue.¹² Thus the schools are totally dependent on the property tax. They must, however, share this tax base with other units of local government. Generally, cities take about .4 of all property taxes,

school districts about .3, counties about .2 and townships and special districts the remaining .1.¹³

As previously mentioned, the property tax was severely weakened by the depression and war. When the long overdue reform came, it was directed at all three phases of property taxation—assessment, levying and collection. Emphasis was placed on the hiring of full-time, professional assessors trained to use modern objective formulas for assessing property. Additionally, state assistance was made available to localities in terms of specialized knowledge and statistical data for the comparison and evaluation of local assessments. In terms of the levy itself, reform was needed to enlarge the taxing units in order to provide a realistic financial basis for school support. A relaxing of unrealistic tax and debt limits was also necessary to permit school districts to support education to the extent they desired. Finally, with rising tax collections, it became necessary to permit citizens to pay taxes on an installment basis. Citizen involvement in the assessment process, as well as in the budgeting process, was essential to reform so that the taxpayer would look favorably upon the need for increased expenditures.

Rapid inflation of the economy in the past six years has accounted for many of the increased costs of education.*¹² In turn, these increases are translated into higher property taxes because about 50 per cent of local property taxes go for school operations.*¹³ This situation has led to the widely publicized "taxpayers' revolt."¹⁴ Defeats of major state tax measures also result in a cutback in financial resources available for state school aid programs.

Financing capital improvements in school districts is a special problem. Because districts are for the most part limited to selling bonds for the major portion of their capital budgets, bond issue elections are critical to the implementation of building programs. Results of these elections have shown a steady decline in approval since 1964, when 74.7 per cent of the issues and 79.4 per cent of the dollar amounts were approved by the voters. The approval rate for 1968-1969 dropped to 56.8 per cent of the issues and 43.6 per cent of the dollar value. In spite of this action, capital expenditures continue to increase. From a mere \$111-million expenditure in 1945-1946, the cost of capital improvements has risen to \$4.5 billion in

¹³ Howard R. Jones, *Financing Public Elementary and Secondary Education* (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966), p. 59.

¹⁴ For a full discussion of costs, see *Current History*, July, 1972.

¹⁵ The 50 per cent figure includes city and county expenditures for education. For this reason, it is higher than the .3 property tax figure previously stated which counted only property taxes levied by independent school districts.

¹⁶ For an article on the taxpayers' revolt, see *Current History*, July, 1972.

¹⁷ U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *State Government Finances in 1970* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 6.

1971-1972. As a per cent of budgets, 1972 finds capital improvements down to 9.6 per cent from the previous high of 23 per cent during the peak building years.

STATE FINANCE

State governments finance 40.9 per cent of all local school expenditures. For 1971-1972, this will amount to \$19.063 billion, an increase of \$18.001 billion over 1945-1946, when states accounted for 34.7 per cent of local expenditures. In 1970, 22.1 per cent of all state expenditures went for local school distributions.

Unlike local school districts, the states have not been confined to any one revenue source to finance these expenditures. Indeed, until the late 1950's and early 1960's, states had a relatively easy task in raising necessary funds for schools, because their revenue sources were responsive to increased economic activity. Currently the 50 states receive 90.6 per cent of their revenue from five sources: 1) sales and gross receipts taxes, 35.1 per cent; 2) individual and corporate income taxes, 16.8 per cent; 3) current charges for services, 7.9 per cent; 4) various license taxes, 6.0 per cent; and 5) federal grants-in-aid, 24.8 per cent. In 1940, only 16 states employed both a sales and income tax. By 1951 three states had been added to this list and since 1960, 17 more states have adopted dual sales-income tax systems.¹⁵

Equally as important as raising state revenues for schools is the process by which these funds are distributed. Generally, states use one of five distinct types of distribution for basic school support, although each state varies somewhat in the details of allocation. "Flat grant" programs are currently used for basic support in seven states. This type of program provides to each school district a lump sum payment on a per pupil or teacher basis.

"Strayer-Haig-Mort" plans are utilized by 34 states. This popular plan gained wide acceptance during the 1930's and 1940's. Under this system, different educational needs are recognized and assigned weights on a per pupil or teacher basis. The amount of state support is then figured on that basis after a minimum local tax effort is deducted from the total support program. In effect, the state makes up the difference between a previously determined level of expenditure and the amount of money raised locally by a fixed tax rate.

"Percentage equalizing" plans are used in six states. These plans are similar to the Strayer-Haig-Mort plans except that distributed funds are based not upon a fixed tax levy, but upon the ratio of a district's wealth per pupil compared with the state's average district wealth per pupil.

A "guaranteed valuation" plan is employed in two states. Under this system, the state guarantees to local districts a fixed number of dollars per pupil or

teacher unit for each mill of property taxes. One state has a full state support program with no locally produced revenues being used to finance schools.

The former popularity of flat grants continues to decline. For 1949-1950, 55.1 per cent of all state funds were allocated on that basis. By 1968-1969, the percentage of flat grants had decreased to 22.5.¹⁶ In addition to these basic support programs, states employ a variety of matching grants for various special education needs.

CHANGING PATTERNS OF STATE AID

State aid to education in the 1940's was primarily a problem of distribution rather than taxation. The concern was for equity of distribution, recognition of localized needs and a support program that incorporated local fiscal capacity. These concerns resulted in refinements in foundation programs, provisions for local leeway in excess of the minimum program and the enactment of requirements for a minimum local tax effort. During the 1950's, emphasis shifted to the sources of revenue and a further refinement of distribution theory to recognize measures of fiscal capacity other than personal income. Eleven states enacted general sales taxes and eight states adopted individual income tax laws during these years. The decade of the 1960's saw a continuation of the concern with the raising of additional tax dollars and criticism of Strayer-Haig-Mort financing plans.¹⁷ It was at about this time that the fixed valuation concept was first utilized. This was also the period in which Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act providing funds for a variety of educational needs.

State grants for school construction increased sharply after World War II. Between 1950 and 1957, 38 programs in 29 states distributed over \$900 million to school districts for construction assistance. Of the programs, all but five had been established since the war.¹⁸ In eleven states, construction loan programs have been started since 1945. Several states also authorized the creation of school building authorities which issue bonds, construct schools and employ a lease-sale plan to transfer properties to local districts. This technique is utilized to avoid legal debt limits imposed on school districts and to circumvent requirements for voter approval of school bond issues. Still other states give assistance by guaranteeing local debt or by the outright purchase of school bonds.

¹⁶ Roe L. Johns, Kern Alexander, and Dewey H. Stellar, eds., *Status and Impact of Educational Finance Programs* (Gainesville, Fla.: National Educational Finance Project, 1971), pp. 32, 122-23.

¹⁷ Gauerke and Childress, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-162.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 270.

¹⁹ H. George Frederickson and Yong Hyo Cho, "Sixties' Reapportionment: Is It Victory or Delusion?" *National Civic Review*, Vol. 60, No. 2 (February, 1971).

The United States Supreme Court has exerted an influence on state school finance since 1962 when it ruled in *Baker v. Carr* (369 U.S. 186) that state legislatures must be reapportioned to reflect recent shifts in population. Studies prior to reapportionment indicated that high levels of state aid were forthcoming from those states which were malapportioned but that this aid was not being equitably distributed—especially in metropolitan areas. After reapportionment had been accomplished in a number of states, it was noted that the funds for education did not rise at as rapid a pace as they had, but that they were being more fairly distributed.¹⁹

A new chapter in the history of educational finance appears to be beginning to unfold. Within the past year, traditional patterns of school finance have been the target for strong criticism.

The California Supreme Court ruled in August, 1971, that the state's system for financing education was unconstitutional, and that a new basis for the allocation of funds would have to be found that did not link expenditures to the wealth of school districts. Since then courts in Minnesota, Texas and New Jersey have reached similar conclusions. In each case, the legislatures must act to correct inequities which arise when school districts obtain unequal amounts of revenue from equal tax rates. Certainly the guaranteed valuation plans used in Utah and Wisconsin would appear to meet this concept of equality. So also would the full state funding plan in Hawaii.

THE OUTLOOK

On balance, it seems reasonably safe to assume that the rate of shift of financial responsibility for schools from local to state levels will increase. Further, it is probable that at least a significant portion of any added revenues for schools will come from sources other than local property taxes. Beyond this, there still remains a wide range of alternative paths to achieve equity in school finance. The political decisions that must be made to effect these basic changes in tax structure and burden will certainly create a storm in state legislatures across the country. Nevertheless, the machinery has been set in motion, and the process of change and adaptation has begun. Hopefully, these changes will bring about a genuine effort to obtain equal educational opportunity for all children regardless of the financial resources available within local school districts.

Peter D. Veillette, a staff associate with the research division of the National Education Association, is responsible for research and analysis of data pertaining to state and local educational finance. Previously he was employed by the National League of Cities in Washington, D.C., in a research capacity, and as a budget analyst with the City of Hartford, Connecticut.

"We know that in many places local government unfortunately cannot adequately finance either the freedom or the facilities to learn. And there the federal government can properly supplement local resources."

—Franklin Roosevelt

Federal Financing of Education, 1945-1972

BY ARTHUR YNE J. TAYLOR

Staff Associate, Research Division, National Education Association

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT in financing education, which has traditionally been considered a state and local responsibility, has long been a topic of acrimonious debate. Congress has been the forum for most of the discussion. Proposals for general support of public schools by the federal government have been inextricably entangled in the national issues of racial segregation, separation of church and state, states' rights and federal administrative control.

Traditionally, the federal government has engaged in two types of educational activities: (1) operating educational programs of its own, and (2) aiding the states and territories in financing and otherwise promoting education.¹

The federal government engages in a wide variety of educational programs which are not related to public elementary and secondary education. Many of these programs are administered by federal agencies other than the Office of Education, which currently administers 132 educational programs. Examples include education of dependent children overseas through the Department of Defense; education programs for Indian children by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; the operation of some public schools by the Atomic Energy Commission; the operation of public schools in the District of Columbia; and numerous science programs by the National Science Foundation.

The methods used in distributing funds to these programs vary on the basis of the nature of the aid and the purposes (general and special or categorical) of the funding. The specific method is outlined in sec-

tions of the federal enactments that provide for the authorization, appropriation and expenditure of funds. Federal enactments have provided for funds to be: (1) allotted on the basis of *land areas*, (2) distributed in proportion to *population* figures, (3) awarded to the states as *flat grants*, (4) given on condition that *matching funds* are provided from state and local revenues, (5) provided as the *cost of an educational program* or of operating a school, (6) apportioned to meet a federal obligation such as *payments in lieu of taxes* on federally owned property, (7) allocated as *equalization aids* to provide greater assistance to the financially weaker areas, (8) paid to cover the *cost of tuition* and of other educational expenses of individuals, and (9) granted in accordance with *contracts for services* on research programs in various colleges, universities and industries.²

The New York State Education Department outlines the three methods most generally used in allocating federal funds as follows:

Method A—Allocation of Federal funds directly to State educational agency from United States Office of Education and amount of local educational agency's allocation computed by the State educational agency under formula stipulated in Federal law and Federal Rules and Regulations....

Method B—Allocation of Federal funds directly to State Educational agency from U. S. Office of Education but amount of local educational agency's allocation *not* specified by Federal agency. The unused portion of local educational agency's allocation is available for use by another local agency....

Method C—Allocation of Federal funds not directly to State educational agency but to local educational agency from U. S. Office of Education based upon individual Federal projects. The unused portion of local education agency's allocation is not available for use by another local agency or project. Federal funds may

¹ Charles A. Quattlebaum, "Federal Educational Policies, Programs and Proposals," Part I, House Committee on Education and Labor (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, December, 1968), p. 13.

² Clayton D. Hutchins, *et al.*, "Federal Funds for Education (No. 5) 1954-55 and 1955-56," U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1956), pp. 6-10.

or may not be channeled through the State education agency. . . .³

Most federal funds are distributed directly to state agencies which then allocate the funds to local districts on the basis of a state plan. The state plan usually must have the approval of a federal agency before the funds are allocated to the state.

Beginning with the Morrill Act of 1862 and continuing through the 92d Congress, a great number of categorical aid programs have been developed in times of national crisis, as pointed out by Frank Munger and Richard Fenno:

More than any single cause, the rate of selective service rejections produced the demands for federal aid in 1918. Strengthened by other forces, the repetition of the same events in the World War II draft produced the 1943 Senate debate on federal aid. The depression forced emergency aid to education in the 1930's. The severe post-war teacher shortage stimulated the federal aid proposals of the late 1940's. The baby boom of the 1950's—abetted by suburban sprawl—generated the school construction bills of the same decade. Impacted areas legislation followed one national defense crisis, while the National Defense Education Act was called into existence by the cold war crisis that followed the launching of the Soviet Sputnik. Apparently no crisis has yet been big enough to justify general aid to education.⁴

This tradition was extended with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 which was, in large measure, a response to a national crisis in poverty and race relations.

In terms of federal expenditures, national defense has consistently far outranked education in budgetary outlays, although the percentage allocated for education has steadily increased. The table below is an excerpt of the table "Percent Distribution of Budget Outlays by Function":⁵

National Defense Education and Manpower

1945	85.7	.2
1950	30.4	.5
1955	58.7	.8
1960	49.8	1.1
1965	41.9	1.9
1970	40.8	3.7
1973	31.8	4.6

³ The State Education Department, Bureau of Educational Finance Research, "Understanding Financial Support of Public Schools—1970-71" (Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, September, 1970), pp. 35-36.

⁴ Frank Munger, Jr., and Richard F. Fenno, *National Priorities and Federal Aid to Education* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1962), pp. 16-17.

⁵ "The Budget," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, January 29, 1972, p. 169.

⁶ 78:1 *Congressional Record* (1943), p. 8399.

⁷ *Federal Role in Education*, "Chronology of Education Legislation" (Washington, D. C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1965), pp. 17-32.

⁸ Quattlebaum, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-81.

STRUGGLES FOR GENERAL SCHOOL AID

Immediately following World War II, national attention was focused on the problems of education. Selective service rejections during the war emphasized continuing illiteracy, and the shortage of teachers and classrooms dramatized the demand for federal action.

Reflecting on the near full century history of the federal aid struggle, Senator Lister Hill (D., Ala.), during the Senate debate on the Educational Finance Act of 1943, proclaimed:

Whether the bill shall pass or not, its enactment is as inevitable as that the day will follow the night.

The longer we live, the more our country develops, the more complex becomes our civilization, the greater and more compelling becomes the need, the absolute necessity for the Federal government to meet its duty, accept its responsibility, carry out its obligation, and play its part in the training and the preparation of the citizenship of America.⁶

This was the first federal aid to education bill that was debated and acted upon in the United States Senate in over 50 years. The setback in the Senate in 1943 was only temporary, for congressional interest in general school aid legislation was again accelerated in 1945. The chronological account of the history of general school aid legislation from 1945 to 1965 shows the bitter controversy over the issues of religion, federal control, and racial segregation that blocked passage of the numerous proposals.⁷ Enthusiasm for federal aid to education was again declining by 1951 in spite of President Harry Truman's appeal in his State of the Union message in 1946 and the "Fair Deal" program in 1949 which made education a key point.

The next major shift was in the direction of permanent legislation to assist schools located in federally impacted areas. This movement resulted in extension of the principle of the Lanham Act of 1941 to passage of two Federal Impact Laws in 1950 which provided federal aid for construction of school facilities (P.L. 815) and school operation and maintenance (P.L. 874). During the first 20 years of these two enactments, more than \$5 billion was granted to school districts in every state.

In 1955, the White House Conference on Education was authorized by the 83d Congress. By decision of the President's Committee, the conference restricted itself to discussion of problems affecting the elementary and secondary schools, public and nonpublic. The report of the committee contained numerous comments and recommendations relating to the role of the federal government in education.⁸

While general opposition, segregation problems and budget-cutting zeal continued to kill general school aid proposals, attention was diverted by the launching of Sputnik on October 4, 1957. Congress again re-

sponded to an emergency and approved the National Defense Education Act (P.L.85-864) in 1958. Passage of the over \$1-billion program touched every level of education, particularly in the areas of the sciences, mathematics and foreign languages.

In 1961, Kennedy's \$5.8-billion aid-to-public-education proposal and his \$2.3-billion proposal for public elementary and secondary school construction and teacher's salaries were both rejected; the principal blame was assigned to the church-state issue.⁹

A vast number of education programs were affected by the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (desegregation of public schools and colleges). Under Title VI of the 1964 act, school districts and institutions of learning which practiced segregation became ineligible for federal aid money.

After a long struggle, the largest program of federal aid to education was enacted in 1965. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L.89-10) has been erroneously referred to as a "general aid" enactment.

ISSUES AFFECTING FEDERAL AID

There are many issues involved in the enactment of legislation for federal aid to education. These issues have probably stimulated more controversy than any other human resource program. The controversy has been waged primarily between the proponents and the opponents of federal aid to education, influenced in large measure by the issues of race, religion and states' rights. The debate dates back to the year 1870, and not one of these issues has been resolved. After over a century, the same three issues of race, religion and states' rights dominate the stage.

Racial segregation is one of the serious obstacles to agreement on some specific federal aid legislation. The effect of federal aid to education on relations between whites and blacks has been a major ingredient in the congressional debate since the introduction of the Hoar Bill in 1870. One of the purposes of this bill was to continue and expand the public schooling for Negroes that was sponsored and conducted by the Freedmen's Bureau following the Civil War. This bill was rejected. Public schooling was provided, however, but on a segregated basis until 1954, when the Supreme Court ruled that separate schools were inherently unequal. This desegregation decision markedly influenced the development of federal policies and programs.

The issue of racial integration in schools is now largely concerned with the question of "de facto" segregation and creation of a racial "balance" in schools.

⁹ "Death of a Bill," *America* CVII (October 6, 1962), p. 834; "The Cardinal's Claim," *Time* LXXVII (January 27, 1961), p. 62.

¹⁰ Joel S. Berke, *et al.*, "Federal Aid to Public Education: Who Benefits?" U. S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, April, 1971).

The widespread controversy over the busing of children to achieve school desegregation blocked the passage of major educational legislation in the 92d Congress.

The issue of federal aid to nonpublic schools is also a topic of strong debate. This issue involves the subsidiary question of whether federal aid would go to the school or to the child. The issue applies mainly to Roman Catholic parochial schools since they enroll about 90 per cent of the total number of pupils attending nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. The fear for the traditional separation of church and state principle is a dominant factor.

It has been well established in theory, in practice, and in the courts that education is primarily a state function. However, in recent years, federal legislation has placed emphasis on national educational goals. The administration of these federal programs by state personnel has, in many instances, overshadowed state-supported efforts. It is felt that the state's role in educational leadership may be eroded.

According to a recent study conducted by Joel S. Berke, *et al.*, more than 80 per cent of total federal revenues for elementary and secondary education, and more than 95 per cent of such revenues actually going to school districts are appropriated for the following eight programs:¹⁰

- (1) Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families;
- (2) Title II of ESEA, school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials;
- (3) Title III of ESEA, supplementary educational centers and services;
- (4) Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA), financial assistance for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects;
- (5) Title V-A of NDEA, guidance, counseling, and testing;
- (6) Vocational Education (aid for vocational education from all federal programs);
- (7) School Lunch and Milk Program; and
- (8) School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, including Public Law 874 (general aid to offset increased school costs related to federal employees) and Public Law 815 (school construction money for similar purposes).

This study covers a four-year period, beginning with the fiscal year prior to implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which provided the large increase in federal education funding, and continuing through the 1968 fiscal year. The levels and purposes of federal appropriations for elementary and secondary education have been minor in the two subsequent fiscal years following this study.

One of the conclusions of this study of the impact of federal aid in 37 large metropolitan areas was that "overall federal aid provides proportionately more aid

TABLE I: PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL REVENUE RECEIPTS FROM FEDERAL SOURCES: 1945-1971

School year	Amount (in thousands)	Percentage Distribution
1945-46	\$ 41,378	1.4
1947-48	120,270	2.8
1949-50	155,848	2.9
1951-52	227,711	3.5
1953-54	355,237	4.5
1955-56	441,442	4.6
1956-57*	377,778	3.7
1957-58	486,484	4.0
1958-59*	446,950	3.6
1959-60	508,458	4.4
1960-61*	582,301	3.8
1961-62	760,975	4.3
1962-63*	681,964	3.6
1963-64	896,956	4.4
1964-65*	834,202	3.8
1965-66	1,996,954	7.9
1966-67*	2,162,892	7.9
1967-68	2,806,469	8.8
1968-69*	2,570,704	7.4
1969-70*	2,767,045	7.2
1970-71*	3,128,831	7.2
1971-72**	3,305,707	7.1

* Revised Estimates by NEA Research Division.

** Unrevised Estimates by NEA Research Division.

Source: National Education Association, Research Division, *Advanced Estimates of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1956-57; Estimates of School Statistics (1958-59 to 1971-72)* (Washington, D.C.: The Association), U.S. Office of Education, *Statistics of State School Systems* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963, 1964, 1967, 1968).

to the fiscally threatened core cities than to their more favored environs." This study also revealed that "federal aid reaching school districts has differed from year to year and has followed no discernible pattern." It concluded with the final statement that "until the federal government assumes the responsibility for providing an adequate and equitable pattern of aid to education, the crisis in American education will continue."

FEDERAL REVENUES

Some of the grants for educational programs require matching state appropriations and others are outright. Since the late 1950's, newly established federal grants have not been in the form of general aid but have been designated for specific purposes (categorical), such as aid for vocational education, for school lunches, for the federally affected school districts, and for a variety of special programs under the National Defense Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The tendency has been to ensure each state a minimum sum, with additional sums calculated according to varying formulas based on such factors as need, local effort and school population.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare administers approximately one-third of all federal funds annually appropriated for education and training programs. The United States Office of Education administers the funds authorized and appropriated by Congress. From time to time, however, educational programs move from one jurisdiction to another, as new agencies or departments are established or old ones are altered or reorganized. Therefore, it is difficult to collect and compare educational finance data.

The revenue from the federal government is still a relatively minor amount of financial support for public schools as indicated in Table I. These figures reveal the unpredictability of federal aid appropriations. Revenue receipts derived from federal sources reached a peak of 4.6 per cent of the total school revenues in 1955-1956, but declined to 3.8 per cent in 1964-1965.

(Continued on page 306)

Arthuryne J. Taylor, a staff associate in the research division of the National Education Association, Washington, D. C., was formerly associate professor of education at Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee, and visiting professor at other universities.

"Official public support for nonpublic schools is not new. There has historically always been recognition that some public goals may be achieved through private, voluntary (including religiously sponsored) agencies and that the public well-being is thereby well served."

Aid to Nonpublic Schools: Historical and Social Perspectives

By NEIL G. MCCLUSKEY

Dean of Teacher Education, Lehman College, City University of New York

IN COMPARISON WITH the heated debates of even a decade ago, perhaps the most striking difference in 1972's discussions over tax support for private and parochial schools is the new note of urbanity. Though shrill voices on both sides still repeat the old clichés, reason and public concern now seem more dominant in the argument, as fair solutions are sought to one of America's perennial social problems.

The United States Office of Education figures for 1970-1971 show that one of every ten elementary and secondary school youngsters is enrolled in a nonpublic school, a total exceeding 5.2 million. About 83 per cent of this group, or 4,367,000, are enrolled in Catholic schools while the remainder is divided among nonpublic schools under private or other religious group sponsorship.¹ Though since the time of Archbishop John Hughes of New York no really new argument has been advanced in favor of or in opposition to public support for these institutions, certain arguments seem to be more cogent today than before.²

For instance, in a letter of greeting to the 1972 convention of the National Catholic Educational Association in Philadelphia, President Richard M. Nixon wrote:

Nonpublic schools in the United States have been in-

tegral to our nation's educational system from the very beginning and today they provide competitive alternatives to the public schools. Through this competition, both systems profit. Should any single school system—public or nonpublic—ever gain a monopoly over the training of our children, the resulting loss of competition would hurt both the individual school system and the country.³

This argument is based on the acceptance of nonpublic schools as a valid partner in American education and a legitimate channel for fulfilling the compulsory school attendance laws. It is a far removal from the nativist reasoning that such schools are "divisive," "un-democratic," or "un-American," remarks which regularly punctuated the debates of the 1940's and 1950's.

In the spring of 1972, in its final report putting the case for continued and expanded support of nonpublic schools, the President's Commission on School Finance advanced two other arguments. The first treats of the financial crux of the matter: "If all nonpublic schools were to close

... the total increases in public school operating costs might run from as low as about \$1.3 billion to as high as \$3.2 billion, and the cost of building new facilities would range from \$4.7 billion to just short of \$10 billion.⁴

Moreover, says the commission, the burden would fall hardest where it can be least supported:

Nearly half of the nonpublic school children attend schools in center cities. Of the total elementary and secondary school enrollment in our 10 largest cities, 24.6 per cent is found in nonpublic schools.⁵

In addition, the commission underscored the role played by these schools in preserving some semblance of racial balance in the inner city by providing an educational alternative for many families who otherwise would flee the neighborhood.

The roughly one-quarter of the nation's population

¹ Only a small handful of religious groups, other than the Catholic Church, have established school systems of any size. A contemporary phenomenon, however, is the movement for all-day Jewish schools, now numbering well over 400 and enrolling close to 90,000 pupils. The new segregationist "private" schools of the South are not within the purview of this article which, in the nature of things, will treat mainly Catholic private and parochial schools.

² The controversy has been going on since the 1840's. The separate parochial school as a system to provide for the total schooling of Catholic children might never have come about—at least on the scale it did—had the mood of nineteenth century America been different. See the author's *Catholic Education Faces Its Future* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1969), chapters 2 and 3.

³ Letter of April 3, 1972.

⁴ Report of the Commission.

⁵ *Ibid.*

which in varying degrees identifies itself today as Catholic differs markedly from earlier generations. For one thing, the reform energies loosed by the Second Vatican Council have increasingly eased traditional Protestant-Catholic tensions in the United States and have resulted in a reappraisal of relationships within the Church itself. The tight institutional discipline which was for so long an object of uneasiness or fear by many Americans is a thing of the past. Today bishops operate more freely of Rome; priests function with larger autonomy from episcopal authority; above all, the Catholic laity live their religious commitment more and more independently of any ecclesiastical organization.⁶ To put it another way, the sheep no longer wait obediently for the voice of the pastor.

As a consequence, one no longer expects to find a solid unanimity or "Catholic" position on any ethical or social problem, but now one can anticipate finding Catholics as diverse in their attitudes as any other subgroup in our society. Nowhere is this truer than in the question of public monies for the support of private and parochial schools.

The "child benefit" principle undoubtedly commands the broadest consensus. Catholic supporters of nonpublic schools generally agree that all pupils are entitled in basic justice to share items which fall under the "child benefit" principle. However, like the President's commission, many supporters of Catholic schools today are aware that "child benefit services alone will not make a substantial contribution toward the solution of the nonpublic schools' financial crisis." There are advocates of tuition reimbursement, scholarships, tax credits and tax deductions. On the other hand, there are Catholic officeholders, politicians and just plain citizens who oppose any form of tax support for parochial schools, and do so with as much conviction as the most doctrinaire supporter of exclusively public education. Moreover, a growing number of Catholics are challenging the whole concept of separate schools for Catholic children and are no longer inclined to patronize them.

The decay of the cities, the situation of minority groups and the fluctuations of the economy are other factors forcing Americans of every religious persuasion—or none—to a larger awareness of the obligation to help all American children get a superior education.

⁶ A Gallup study reports that the decline in church attendance in recent years has been most pronounced among Catholics. According to the study, "In 1971, some 57 per cent attended church in a typical week, following a steady decline since 1964, when 71 per cent of Roman Catholics attended church on the average. . . ." (*The New York Times*, January 9, 1972).

⁷ George Elford, *A Report on U. S. Catholic Schools, 1970-71* (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 1971), p. 4.

⁸ Elford, "Current Statistics on Catholic Schools, 1971-72," *Today's Catholic Teacher*, May, 1972.

⁹ *State Aid to Non-Public Schools*. A Publication of the Department of Special Projects, National Catholic Educational Association, 1971.

The cost of public education has doubled over the past ten years, and the tax-paying public is becoming increasingly reluctant to approve new bond issues to meet soaring school expenses even when they are needed. While in 1965 voters were rejecting about one of four bond proposals, the rejection rate is now over 40 per cent. Hence, the closing of Catholic schools is inadvertently exacerbating the plight of the public schools.

CATHOLIC ENROLLMENT PEAK

The peak enrollment year for Catholic elementary schools was 1964, with 4,533,771 pupils; three years later, in 1961, the secondary schools reached their all-time high of 1,092,521. Total school enrollment dropped by 4.9 per cent in 1968, 5.7 per cent in 1969, and 6.2 per cent in 1970. Though the decline may be interpreted as "a retreat from the dramatic expansion of the late fifties and early sixties," it is still continuing.⁷ The 1971-1972 estimated decrease in the elementary school population is seven per cent; for the high schools, it is four per cent, though the elementary school drop is partially explained by the declining national birthrate.⁸ Present first-grade totals in Catholic schools are only 85 per cent of the sixth-grade figures. Hundreds of Catholic schools have been forced to shut their doors; as a result, during the past five years an additional million pupils have been forced back on the public schools.

The central source of teachers for the parochial schools has been the teaching orders of religious and priests. Each of the last five years has seen several thousand religious women leave their convents and a diminishing flow of recruits entering religious life to replace them. At a somewhat more moderate rate, the pool of priest-teachers and religious Brothers has diminished. It is no secret that their replacements in the classroom—qualified lay teachers—are expecting, demanding and getting salaries and fringe benefits, not merely larger salaries than salaries given to religious and priests, but competitive with those in public schools. Thirty-two states have passed or have introduced measures to assist in the payment of salaries to provide some relief for this most expensive part of the operational costs of a school.⁹ Invariably, these steps are opposed by those who see in them a violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and/or to the laws of the particular state which touch on the establishment of religion.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

What is really at issue here is the question: To what extent should or may the state support religious schools? As part of a comprehensive program to promote educational excellence for its schoolchildren, may the federal government or state government provide secular educational benefits to the public in private

nonprofit schools, church-related as well as non-denominational? This is the general constitutional question.

The question actually is not whether religion benefits or suffers by the provision of secular educational benefits in all private nonprofit as well as public schools, but whether the help or hurt that results from such a non-religious educational program or pupil benefit is the kind of benefit or detriment forbidden by the First Amendment or by the individual state constitution.

Although the United States Supreme Court has upheld state legislation which provides certain child benefits, when tests are made in state courts the problem most often lies in the narrow, restrictive wording of the state constitution rather than in any lack of concern on the part of voters, legislators and judges. This is why the citizens of certain states—New York and Wisconsin, among recent examples—modified their state constitutions in order to extend the benefits of bus^{ing} to all schoolchildren.

TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SUPPORT

Official public support for nonpublic schools is not new. There has historically always been recognition that some public goals may be achieved through private, voluntary (including religiously sponsored) agencies and that the public well-being is thereby well served. In some way or other not only the federal government but every state in the union has been providing some forms of assistance for children attending secularly qualified nonpublic schools. The classic forms, it is true, have been peripheral: transportation, health services, enriched dietary programs, special provision for the handicapped, textbooks and driver education.

However, in very recent years, the federal government and some state legislatures have moved even further. In 1965, the Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, renewing it in 1968 and in 1971. A series of provisions in Titles I, II and III of the law brought additional benefits to nonpublic school children, in particular to the disadvantaged. However, the biggest innovation among the states was the action of Pennsylvania in 1968 which was followed by Connecticut, Rhode Island and Ohio in 1969, and by other states in the past two years. Each of these states passed a kind of "purchase-of-services" legislation which was to provide salary assistance in selected secular subjects for nonprofit, private and church-related schools.

The "purchase-of-services" from church sponsored institutions is a concept which has been consistently upheld by the courts in *special* areas and for *special categories* of recipient. For many years the federal

government and most states have turned to private institutions for the care of abandoned children, orphans, the physically and mentally handicapped, juvenile delinquents and the indigent aged and infirm. The national Medicare legislation is only the most recent widespread application of the principle that the state may utilize any existing facility to ease the burden of medical costs and hospitalization for its citizens. The fact that the home or the hospital is conducted by an all-Jewish board or the Sisters of Charity is irrelevant to the state's purpose. Admittedly, the Pennsylvania "purchase-of-services" legislation broadened the category of recipient, but its sponsors argued the legality of the bill on the recognizable distinction between religious and secular values, between church and state objectives.

Four years ago, the United States Supreme Court did accept the distinction between secular and religious values in education. The Court held (three justices dissenting) that the 1965 New York State law requiring local public school authorities to lend textbooks free of charge to pupils in church-related schools was not a "law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and so was not in conflict with the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. In looking to its own prior decisions, the Court cited the 1947 *Everson v. Board of Education* case as most nearly to the point, and noted that the payment of bus fares upheld as constitutional in that case, "was . . . not such support of a religious institution as to be a prohibited establishment of religion within the meaning of the First Amendment."

Speaking for the court, Mr. Justice Byron White further pointed out:

Considering this attitude, the continued willingness to rely on private school systems, including parochial systems, strongly suggests that a wide segment of informed opinion, legislative and otherwise, has found that those schools do an acceptable job of providing secular education to their students.

This judgment is further evidence that parochial schools are performing, in addition to their sectarian function, the task of secular education.¹⁰

(Continued on page 306)

Neil G. McCluskey, S.J., formerly served as Dean-Director of The Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Notre Dame. He has been a visiting professor at Union Theological Seminary, at Columbia University Teachers College and at The Oppenheimer Institute in Lusaka, Zambia. Among his books are *Public Schools and Moral Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958); *Catholic Viewpoint on Education* (New York: Doubleday, 1959); and *Catholic Education Faces Its Future* (New York: Doubleday, 1969).

¹⁰ *Board of Education v. Allen*, 392 U.S. 236 (1968).

CURRENT DOCUMENTS

The President's Message to Congress on Equal Educational Opportunity, 1972

On March 17, 1972, President Richard M. Nixon sent Congress a message urging passage of an act to place a moratorium on new busing to achieve racial desegregation and an act to provide equal educational opportunity by increasing federal school aid funds. Excerpts from his message on increased federal aid to elementary and secondary schools follow:

If we were simply to place curbs on busing and do nothing more, then we would not have kept faith with the hopes, the needs—or the rights—of the neediest of our children.

Even adding the many protections built into the rights and remedies sections of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act, we would not by this alone provide what their special needs require.

Busing helps some poor children; it poses a hardship for others; but there are many more, and in many areas the great majority—in the heart of New York, and in South Chicago, for example—whom it could never reach.

If we were to treat busing as some sort of magic panacea, and to concentrate our efforts and resources on that as the principal means of achieving quality education for blacks and other minorities, then in these areas of dense minority concentration a whole generation could be lost.

If we hold massive busing to be, in any event, an unacceptable remedy for the inequalities of educational opportunity that exist, then we must do more to improve the schools where poor families live.

Rather than require the spending of scarce resources on ever-longer bus rides for those who happen to live where busing is possible, we should encourage the putting of those resources directly into education—serving all the disadvantaged children, not merely those on the bus routes.

In order to reach the great majority of the children who most need extra help, I propose a new approach to financing the extra efforts required: one that puts the money where the needs are, drawing on the funds I have requested for this and the next fiscal year under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and under the Emergency School Aid Act now pending before the Congress.

As part of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act, I propose to broaden the uses of the funds under the Emergency School Aid Act, and to provide the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with additional authority to encourage effective special learning programs in those schools where the needs are greatest.

Detailed program criteria would be spelled out in administrative guidelines—but the intent of this program is to use a major portion of the \$1.5 billion Emergency School Aid money as, in effect, incentive grants to encourage eligible

districts to design educational programs that would do three things:

— Assure (as a condition of getting the grant) that the district's expenditures on its poorest schools were at least comparable to those on its other schools.

— Provide, above this, a compensatory education grant of approximately \$300 per low-income pupil for schools in which substantial numbers of the students are from poor families, if the concentration of poor students exceeds specified limits.

— Require that this compensatory grant be spent entirely on basic instructional programs for language skills and mathematics, and on basic supportive services such as health and nutrition.

— Provide a "bonus" to the receiving school for each pupil transferring from a poor school to a non-poor school where his race is in the minority, without reducing the grant to the transferring school.

Priority would be given to those districts that are desegregating either voluntarily or under court order, and to those that are addressing problems of both racial and economic impaction.

Under this plan, the remaining portion of the \$1.5 billion available under the Emergency School Aid Act for this and the next fiscal year would go toward the other kinds of aid originally envisaged under it.

This partial shift of funds is now possible for two reasons: First, in the nearly 2 years since I first proposed the Emergency School Aid Act, much of what it was designed to help with has already been done. Second, to the extent that the standards set forth in the Equal Educational Opportunities Act would relieve desegregating districts of some of the more expensive requirements that might otherwise be laid upon them, a part of the money originally intended to help meet those expenses can logically be diverted to these other, closely related needs. I would stress once again, in this connection, the importance I attach to final passage of the Emergency School Aid Act: those districts that are now desegregating still need its help, and the funds to be made available for these new purposes are an essential element of a balanced equal opportunity package.

(Continued on page 311)

FEDERAL FINANCING, 1945-1972

(Continued from page 301)

However, it is significant to note that the appropriation in 1963-1964 represents an increase over 1945 of 2067.7 per cent.

In 1965, the federal share more than doubled, rising from 3.8 per cent to 7.9 per cent; and during the span of 10 years, it increased to an estimated \$1.5 billion. This major breakthrough in federal aid to education came during the 89th Congress with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L.89-10) that provided \$1.3 billion for the first year. This program was authorized in 1965 but not funded until late in the 1966 fiscal year. (ESEA has never been fully funded.)

Federal revenue receipts for school support reached another peak (8.8 per cent) in 1967-1968, representing an increase over 1945 of 6682.5 per cent. It then sharply declined to an estimated 7.1 per cent in 1971-1972. Although the federal share of educational support is currently considered by many educators to be relatively low, it has shown an increase of 7889.0 per cent since the close of World War II.

The foregoing federal revenue receipts with respect to the current rise of inflation reported in the 13th Annual *Cost of Education Index* are noteworthy:

The 1970's may be the decade when the rate of increase in both spending and enrollment flattens out. Although costs, as reflected in the budgets . . . continued to rise, they did not keep pace with the eroding effects of inflation.

Inflation increased the base year (1957-59) median costs through 1970-71 by 73 per cent. Figures for 1971-72 show an inflationary increase of 7 per cent over a year ago, which, when translated into terms of the base year, make the 1971-72 cost 185% of 1957-59. It now costs \$185 to buy the equivalent of \$100 worth of 1957-59 educational services. . . .

. . . The rise of inflation in school spending continues. This year's increase over last year is 7 per cent. As inflation continues, net current expenditures begin to level off.¹¹

There is widespread talk of a fiscal crisis in the schools with state expenditures currently exceeding revenues. It is claimed that local and state financing of public education must be reinforced by national support. Education is emerging as a state-local-federal partnership, and efforts are being directed toward determining the most effective utilization of this partnership. Research and study are focused on this interdisciplinary concern in an attempt both to understand the complexity of the relationship and to realize its full potential.

The degree to which the federal government should equitably share its vast resources to improve the quality of American public education is still a national topic of debate.

¹¹ "The Cost of Education Index," *School Management* 16:21-26 (January, 1972).

AID TO NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Continued from page 304)

Opponents of the New York law based their case on the contention that there is no such thing as secular education in a sectarian elementary or secondary school. They insisted that the whole curriculum is permeated by religion.

In one sense, yes; in another sense, no. It is true that some Catholic writers on education have talked at times in such exaggerated tones about how religion permeates the Catholic school that one wonders if they have not in mind rather a liturgical service. Yet there is a sense in which the atmosphere of a Catholic school does touch all activities within the institution. But this idea can be exaggerated to the point of nonsense. Sometimes G. K. Chesterton's remark that there is a "Catholic" way even of teaching mathematics is used to buttress the permeation argument.

Whatever Chesterton had in mind, his remark is meaningful only when understood as reflecting the influence of faith or religious commitment upon any phase of a man's life. As St. Paul long ago reminded people, whether eating or drinking or traveling or thinking, they should be doing it all for God—so that "in all things God may be honored." In this sense one can speak of a Catholic way of teaching mathematics, as well as a Catholic way of eating salad, and a Catholic way of practicing politics. One could similarly argue that in the public school, there is an American way of teaching chemistry, an American way of operating a drill press, and an American way of playing baseball, as distinct from a Mexican or Swedish way. (There must be "American" activities because even the United States House of Representatives up until 1969 maintained a House Committee on "Un-American" Activities.)

In other words, there are values associated with every *human* action whether it is exercised within or outside any given set of group values or religious faith. The secular order possesses values of justice, duty, honor, truth, piety, compassion and love independent of any church or religious philosophy. Over and above the values they share in common with all men, by reason of their heritage Americans will enhance these universal values with a certain *American* coloring. Over and above the values they share in common with all Americans, by reason of their heritage *Catholic* Americans can be expected to enhance these American values with a distinctive Catholic coloring.

On June 28, 1971, the United States Supreme Court declared the Pennsylvania and Rhode Island laws to be in violation of the federal constitution. The court did not reject all forms of assistance but outlawed the

(Continued on page 310)

EDUCATION IN COLONIAL AMERICA

(Continued from page 281)

disadvantage of spreading learning very thin. A boy who had attended the school for nine or ten months out of a year when it was located in one place might only be able to attend the moving school the three or four months that it was near his house. If he was determined he might follow the school as it traveled from one spot to the next. But this was such a difficult and expensive process that probably few boys did it.

If many towns sent their schools into outlying sections, an equal number divided themselves into districts and established a school in each. Usually citizens in each district elected a committee charged with responsibility for hiring a master and providing a place for the school to meet. The authority of the district and its committee rarely included more important matters. Towns continued to hold taxing powers and understandably enough were reluctant to share them. Every town allocated annually a portion of its revenues to districts on the basis of their populations. Such divisions were often contested by jealous districts, but on the whole the system worked well.

The success of the system left Rhode Islanders unimpressed, and their legislature steadfastly refused to establish educational standards for its towns. The results for the colony's intellectual life were obvious: in the seventeenth century only one Rhode Island boy attended college. In the next century more traveled to Harvard and Yale but no college took shape in Rhode Island itself until just before the Revolution.¹⁴

Yet there were publicly-supported schools in Rhode Island, even a few which offered instruction in Latin and Greek. But most of these schools were in towns which had been transferred from Massachusetts to Rhode Island on the settlement of a boundary dispute in 1747. Thoroughly imbued with the educational tradition of Massachusetts, they probably never considered dropping their schools in removal from the Bay Colony's jurisdiction.

For the most part, Rhode Islanders relied upon private sources for the support of schools. Often this means failed them; and their schools, compared to those of the neighboring colonies, enjoyed a precarious existence.

Rhode Island's educational history obviously parallels much of that of the southern and middle colonies, where no public commitment to education existed and no private source of support was ever entirely reliable. In no colony did one group monopolize education. Rather, variety in support, in sponsors, in

state participation, and in the forms institutions assumed characterized colonial education. Inevitably educational development followed an uneven course.

It did because it was an expression of a colonial society, which was altering at an uneven pace. Education itself, of course, was a force in this process of change. As it helped shape colonial society, so also was it shaped. What emerged by the end of the colonial period was a peculiar blend of public and private, classical and vocational, religious and secular. Modern "public education" had not yet been conceived.

AMERICAN EDUCATION AFTER 1800

(Continued from page 285)

but some of the academies received aid from public funds.

As the public school system spread and as more young people completed the eighth grade, there was a growing demand for secondary education. Why should parents be made to pay private tuition to give their children a secondary education? Why should they even be required to pay rate-bills? These and other questions were asked increasingly, and the idea grew that the free public schools should be extended upward through the twelfth grade. The movement to establish public-supported high schools began in Massachusetts and New York in the late 1820's and the early 1830's. In the late 1830's, in the 1840's, and in the 1850's, it spread from these states to other Northern states. It found a ready response in the new Western states. However, in some Northern states, including Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Jersey, the high school movement did not really get under way until after 1865, and in the South it did not come until even later.

The rise of the state university to a place of importance in American education did not occur until after the Civil War. By the end of 1860, there were 246 colleges in the United States, but only 17 were state institutions. Most of the colleges were denominational colleges. Only the University of Michigan foreshadowed the great future that was before the state university, for in 1860 Michigan enrolled over 500 students.

Up to the Civil War, the federal government had shown little concern for education. Aside from its land grants to states admitted to the Union after 1800, the federal government stood aloof. However, with the Morrill Act of 1862 the federal government extended aid to land-grant colleges for agricultural education. In 1867, the office of United States Commissioner of Education would be created. And in 1883, the prophetic Blair bill would raise in a large way the question of federal aid to the states for the common school.

¹⁴ Morison, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE SCHOOL

(Continued from page 289)

tionships between students and teachers and linked the school to life outside.¹⁰

In the heart of an industrial center, Gary, Indiana, a flexible curriculum revolved around community and child needs. Here, public schoolchildren conducted mock elections to learn civics and applied the lessons of cooking and accounting in a student-operated lunch room.¹¹ In La Porte and Indianapolis, Indiana, and in Minneapolis, Minnesota, enlightened teachers who integrated studies for active children found rich rewards in heightened interest and greater learning.¹²

The movement to redirect the school was no mere urban phenomenon. From Cornell University in the late 1890's, horticulturalist Liberty Hyde Bailey issued a plea to infuse meaning into rural education through the study of nature. "I want to see our country schools," Bailey wrote, "without screwed-down seats and to see children put to work with tools and soils and plants and problems."¹³

In 1902, in Illinois and Ohio, O. J. Kern and A. B. Graham, both rural school supervisors, simultaneously organized agricultural clubs to combat student and parental lethargy toward education. Youngsters tested soil samples and seed corn, peered through microscopes and, by applying science to agriculture, amazed their parents with increased corn yields, productive poultry flocks, and amazing sugar-beet crops. Out of the rural school came the nucleus organization from which the national 4-H club movement grew.

In the Gilded Age of the post-Civil War decades, the schools extended opportunity for education to a wide proportion of the population. In a society where the intellectual elite and ruling classes were by no means synonymous, the schools developed a multiplicity of tracks within a single educational system universally available to all. By the end of the century, the reform spirit touched all aspects of American life leaving a particular imprint upon the schools whose very function, at all levels, had been redefined.

¹⁰ Francis W. Parker, *Talks on Pedagogies* (New York: John Day Company, 1937), pp. 16, 340.

¹¹ John and Evelyn Dewey, *Schools of Tomorrow* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1915), pp. 175-204.

¹² Joseph Mayer Rice, *The Public-School System of the United States* (New York: The Century Company, 1893), p. 193.

¹³ Liberty Hyde Bailey, *The State and the Farmer* (New York: Macmillan, 1908), pp. 189-190.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(Continued from page 292)

In the fall of 1941, just prior to the entry of the

United States into the Second World War, the Congress passed the Lanham Act which provided aid for the construction, maintenance and operation of schools in districts which were suddenly overcrowded as a result of government war projects. Local communities were usually expected to match in part the funds provided by the Lanham Act; however, if the local communities could not contribute toward the construction of the buildings, the Federal Works Administration often built the buildings and leased them to the local governments.

OTHER PROGRAMS

In addition to the Lanham Act, the Community Facilities Services, authorized by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, provided loans to state and local governments for the planning of educational facilities. The Lanham Act, moreover, was extended and expanded by the passage of Public Laws 815 and 874 during the late years of the war.

Other programs involving various educational activities were initiated by the federal government during the war "in the interest of national security." These programs provided nurseries and special schools for the children of defense workers, vocational training below college-level for defense workers, and engineering and management training in colleges and universities. Around 12 million workers were trained under these programs between 1940 and 1945. The Student War Loan Program was established in the United States Office of Education to provide funds for students in technical and professional areas essential to the war-time effort.

On June 22, 1944, the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346). This Act, combined with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1943 (Public Law 16), authorized programs of unprecedented scope. Public Law 16 provided for the retraining or reeducation of those whose vocational competencies had been destroyed by service-connected disabilities, and Public Law 346 (popularly known as the "G.I. Bill") provided honorably discharged veterans with educational or vocational training for a period of one year plus the number of months served in the armed forces. The cost of the veteran's tuition, books, supplies and equipment were paid directly to the institution which he attended. Over 8 million veterans received benefits under this "G.I. Bill of Rights," at a total cost of approximately \$15 billion.

In addition to the more striking examples of direct federal aid under programs such as the Lanham Act and the "G.I. Bill," the federal government expanded its educational activities into many other areas and made way for the more widespread federal participation in American education which was to follow in the postwar years.

FINANCING EDUCATION TODAY

(Continued from page 278)

eral aid would be called upon to give "foundation," or "percentage equalizing" grants to poor states.

A third goal might be *greater efficiency within the educational process*. Any school system makes decisions on student-staff ratios, the proper lengths of the school day and the school year, and the allocation of available funds into one program and not into another. "Efficiency" in its broadest sense simply attempts to scrutinize the costs and benefits of those decisions so that the best use is made of public resources.

For example, duplication of administrative costs and of small expensive programs can be cut in certain cases by district consolidation or inter-district sharing of facilities. Program budgeting, showing expenditures by *functions* (e.g., preschool education, or the junior high school music program) rather than by *categories* (e.g., maintenance or teacher salaries) can show the true costs of programs and help to set expenditure priorities.¹⁷ If nothing else, program budgeting can force schools to articulate goals and sharpen educational philosophies. State and federal aid to specific programs (categorical grants) can be made more flexible so that schools do not implement costly programs simply because state or federal funds are available—or spend *all* the money in a grant simply because any unexpended funds will have to be returned! State and federal aid could be "forward funded" for a number of years so that schools can plan accordingly.

One of the most controversial goals is the *preservation of a viable private system of elementary and secondary education*.¹⁸ Some would advance this goal on grounds of fairness: Parents of private school children pay taxes for the support of schools and should thus be entitled to some public assistance for whatever school to which they send their children. Others would emphasize the economic self-interest of

¹⁷ See National Educational Finance Project, *Alternatives for Financing Education*, pp. 33-34; and Benson, *op. cit.*, pp. 249-283.

¹⁸ "Private" as used here refers to parochial schools as well.

¹⁹ National Educational Finance Project, *Alternatives for Financing Education*, p. 343.

²⁰ "Private Schools Lose Enrollment," *The New York Times*, March 6, 1972, p. 23; also, National Education Association, Committee on School Finance, *Financial Status of the Public Schools 1971*, Washington, D.C., 1971, p. 11. Much of this enrollment decline, however, seems to be due to the declining value placed on a parochial education by Catholic parents. This suggests a fundamental demand shift at least partly independent of the financial status of their schools or the costs of parochial education.

²¹ For a classic presentation of the case for a voucher system, see Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 85-102. For an excellent case against, see Eli Ginzberg, "The Economics of the Voucher System," *The Teachers College Record*, 72:373-382, February, 1971.

public school parents in preserving a system in which the state and the town are relieved of the financial burden of educating nearly 10 per cent of our nation's schoolchildren. The National Educational Finance Project estimated that all school costs—and that, presumably, means taxes—would rise by 10 per cent if all private schoolchildren were to be absorbed into the public system.¹⁹ Still others, however, would claim that non-use of a public good such as education is the privilege of all citizens (provided, in the case of education, that children are adequately schooled elsewhere), but that this privilege should in no way entitle them to a lower tax burden or to access to public revenues for their own use. Whatever one's largely subjective evaluation of the issue, private school enrollment has declined about 23 per cent over the last seven years—from 7 million in 1965 to 5.4 million in 1972—and this decline will undoubtedly continue without public assistance in some form.²⁰

Proposals to assist private elementary and secondary education are constrained principally by constitutional prohibitions against direct aid to parochial schools. A number of state aid programs purport to assist students rather than schools, and have thus channeled some public money into private school coffers. Other proposals call for aid to school functions such as transportation or food service which are considered sufficiently separate from instruction to avoid church-state entanglements. Federal or state tax credits for tuition paid have also been proposed as a device to subsidize private education indirectly.

The so-called voucher system would go far beyond the maintenance of the existing private system and would place *all* schools on a competitive basis.²¹ Public revenues from whatever source would be channeled not to schools, but to parents in the form of a voucher, or portable grant. Parents would presumably enroll their children and spend their vouchers at those schools which met the test of the market—that is, which offered evidence of best answering the needs of the student. Schools would, of course, be publicly regulated and probably non-profit. And all education would still, at least indirectly, be publicly supported. A voucher system could be financed by any level or combination of governmental levels and through any form of taxation. The radical change proposed by the voucher advocates is the introduction of competition and consumer power over the control of the schools themselves.

The "best" way to finance education, depends almost entirely on the priorities attached to these various goals, as well as upon the political constraints perceived as most compelling. Rational debate on alternative systems of school finance must first sort out the differences in goals and perceived problems which divide proponents of various proposals for reform.

AID TO NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Continued from page 306)

Pennsylvania "purchase-of-services" type of aid and the Rhode Island type of aid that provided a portion of teachers' salaries.¹¹ Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, who wrote the majority opinion, found that there was a fundamental illegality in the two programs because "the cumulative impact of the entire relationship arising under the statutes in each state involves excessive entanglement between government and religion." The opinion stressed the fact that absolute separation between church and state is impossible, and yet this inevitability of contact does not allow the state to engage in relationships which are "pregnant with dangers and excessive government direction of church schools and hence of churches."

It is clear that the Supreme Court has turned away from the absolutist philosophy of 25 years ago which for so long impeded reasonable discussion of what is basically a social issue. In his famous dissent in the landmark 1947 New Jersey bus case, Justice Wiley B. Rutledge had argued that the objective of the First Amendment was "to create a complete and permanent separation of the sphere of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support of religion."¹² A charitable silence is the kindest burial for this kind of historical nonsense but the irony in the absolutist position is that if separation must be complete, permanent and comprehensive, and if a parochial school is simply an extension of the church, how can the state regulate something like driver education in such a school, or how it can even monitor attendance in that school's classroom any more than it can in the church itself?

In reflecting on the still fresh *Lemon* and *DiCenso* decisions, it is also clear that two factors greatly contributed to the negative decision. The present financial crisis in education by itself, many constitutional authorities feel, is hardly justification for rushing precipitously into an "extraordinarily sensitive area of constitutional law." In several recent welfare decisions, the Supreme Court has insisted that the saving of money "is not, in itself, a public purpose of sufficient strength to justify infringements of basic constitutional liberties."¹³

A second factor which—in the human way human

¹¹ *Lemon v. Kurtzman* and *Robinson v. DiCenso*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971).

¹² *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947).

¹³ Charles M. Whelan, "Lessons from the School Aid Decisions," *America*, July 24, 1971.

¹⁴ William Ball, "Church and State: the Absolutist Crusade," *Saturday Review*, January 21, 1967.

¹⁵ William E. McManus, "Project Choose—the Chicago Plan," *America*, April 1, 1972.

¹⁶ Closing address to the annual convention of the National Catholic Educational Association, quoted in *The New York Times*, April 6, 1972.

decisions are made—no doubt made the Court hesitate to accept the logic of the public purpose of nonpublic schools is that the overwhelming number of them are related to a single faith community—the Roman Catholic Church. Again, there is historic irony here. As one observer has pointedly suggested:

The idea of an absolute separation of church and state was carefully ignored during a century and a half of Protestant political and cultural hegemony in the United States, when little dissent was audible over the use of public funds for the support of Protestant institutions of welfare and education. Absolutist thinking on the separation question comes to us with no reliable historical credentials whatsoever.¹⁴

CONCLUSION

Be that as it may, supporters of nonpublic, religiously oriented schools are deluding themselves if they think that their financial problems will be all solved and the future of their schools assured by massive public support. Granted that educational vouchers or tax credits may soon provide important help, especially for central city families desiring to exercise their freedom of choice in schools, by and large the future seems more realistically defined in these words of a veteran Catholic educator:

Forever, it would seem, the main source of school income will be parents' tuition payments and parishioners' donations. Research clearly indicates that the *perceived value* of a particular Catholic school is the key to successful fund raising. When parents and parishioners see their school as a true community of teachers and pupils using updated curriculum and methods, they will respond to fund-raising projects that respect their intelligence and appeal to their generosity.¹⁵

In 1925, the *Pierce* decision in the Oregon school case (268 U.S. 535 [1925]) affirmed that Catholic and other private schools which meet reasonable state standards had the right to exist. It required another 22 years before the Supreme Court got around formally to including Catholic school youngsters and others in private schools in a state's welfare benefits, notably free bus transportation. There was another 21-year interval before the Supreme Court ruled that a state may provide free secular textbooks as a valid part of its concern for the quality of nonpublic school education.

President Nixon insists that workable proposals which the courts can support must be found to keep the nonpublic schools alive and healthy.¹⁶ It will require time for the United States Supreme Court to finish delineating the guidelines within which the state's concern for all its schoolchildren may be spelled out. The issue is at heart a social one which the American people will continue to resolve in their own good sense, in their own practical way, and in their own good time.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE

(Continued from page 305)

I also propose that instead of being terminated at the end of fiscal 1973, as presently scheduled, the Emergency School Aid Act continue to be authorized at a \$1-billion annual level—of which I would expect the greatest part to be used for the purposes I have outlined here. At the current level of funding of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, this would provide a total approaching \$2.5 billion annually for compensatory education purposes.

For some years now, there has been a running debate about the effectiveness of added spending for programs of compensatory or remedial education. Some have maintained there is virtually no correlation between dollar input and learning output; others have maintained there is a direct correlation; experience has been mixed.

What does now seem clear is that while many Title I experiments have failed, many others have succeeded substantially and even dramatically; and what also is clear is that without the extra efforts such extra funding would make possible, there is little chance of breaking the cycle of deprivation.

A case can be made that Title I has fallen short of expectations, and that in some respects it has failed. In many cases, pupils in the programs funded by it have shown no improvement whatever, and funds have frequently been misused or squandered foolishly. Federal audits of state Title I efforts have found instances where naivete, inexperience, confusion, despair, and even clear violations of the law have thwarted the act's effectiveness. In some instances, Title I funds have been illegally spent on unauthorized materials and facilities, or used to fund local services other than those intended by the act, such as paying salaries not directly related to the act's purposes.

The most prevalent failing has been the spending of Title I funds as general revenue. Out of 40 states audited between 1966 and 1970, 14 were found to have spent Title I funds as general revenue.

Too often, one result has been that instead of actually being concentrated in the areas of critical need, Title I moneys have been diffused throughout the system; and they have not reached the targeted schools—and targeted children—in sufficient amounts to have a real impact.

On the positive side, Title I has effected some important changes of benefit to disadvantaged children.

First, Title I has encouraged some states to expand considerably the contributions from state and local funds for compensatory education. In the 1965-66 school year, the states spent only \$2.7 million of their own revenues, but by the 1968-69 school year—largely due to major efforts by California and New York—they were contributing \$198 million.

Second, Title I has better focused attention on pupils who previously were too often ignored. About 8 million children are in schools receiving some compensatory funds. In 46 states programs have been established to aid almost a quarter of a million children of migratory workers. As an added dividend, many states have begun to focus educational attention on the early childhood years which are so important to the learning process.

Finally, local schools have been encouraged by Title I to experiment and innovate. Given our highly decentralized national educational system and the relatively minor role one federal program usually plays, there have been en-

couraging examples of programs fostered by Title I which have worked.

In designing compensatory programs, it is difficult to know exactly what will work. The circumstances of one locality may differ dramatically from those of other localities. What helps one group of children may not be of particular benefit to others. In these experimental years, local educational agencies and the schools have had to start from scratch, and to learn for themselves how to educate those who in the past had too often simply been left to fall further behind.

In the process, some schools did well and others did not. Some districts benefited by active leadership and community involvement, while others were slow to innovate and to break new ground.

While there is a great deal yet to be learned about the design of successful compensatory programs, the experience so far does point in one crucial direction: to the importance of providing sufficiently concentrated funding to establish the educational equivalent of a "critical mass," or threshold level. Where funds have been spread too thinly, they have been wasted or dissipated with little to show for their expenditure. Where they have been concentrated, the results have been frequently encouraging and sometimes dramatic.

In a sample of some 10,000 disadvantaged pupils in California, 82 per cent of those in projects spending less than \$150 extra per pupil showed little or no achievement gain. Of those students in projects spending over \$250 extra per pupil, 94 per cent gained more than one year per year of exposure; 58 per cent gained between 1.4 and 1.9 years per year of exposure. Throughout the country states as widely separated as Connecticut and Florida have recognized a correlation between a "critical mass" expenditure and marked effectiveness.

Of late, several important studies have supported the idea of a "critical mass" compensatory expenditure to afford disadvantaged pupils equal educational opportunity. The New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, the National Educational Finance Project, and the President's Commission on School Finance have all cited the importance of such a substantial additional per pupil expenditure for disadvantaged pupils.

The program which I propose aims to assure schools with substantial concentrations of poor children of receiving an average \$300 compensatory education grant for each child.

In order to encourage voluntary transfers, under circumstances where they would reduce both racial isolation and low-income concentration, any school accepting such transfers would receive the extra \$300 allotted for the transferring student plus a bonus payment depending on the proportion of poor children in that school.

One key to the success of this new approach would be the "critical mass" achieved by both increasing and concentrating the funds made available; another would be vigorous administrative follow-through to ensure that the funds are used in the intended schools and for the intended purposes.

* * *

The great majority of Americans, of all races, want their Government—the Congress, the Judiciary and the Executive—to follow the course of deliberation, not confrontation. To do this we must act calmly and creatively, and we must act together.

The great majority of Americans, of all races, want schools that educate and rules that are fair. That is what these proposals attempt to provide.

THE MONTH IN REVIEW

A CURRENT HISTORY chronology covering the most important events of April, 1972, to provide a day-by-day summary of world affairs.

INTERNATIONAL

Disarmament

Apr. 10—In a formal ceremony at the Soviet Foreign Ministry in Moscow, 47 states sign a convention outlawing biological weapons and requiring states to destroy their stockpiles. 70 nations have signed the agreement, which becomes final when 22 nations deposit instruments of ratification. The U.S., the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain are among the signatories.

European Economic Community (Common Market)

(See also *France*)

Apr. 11—The European Common Market reports that wage costs in European industry climbed at a higher rate than wage costs in the U.S. during 1971. This was true of all E.E.C. countries except West Germany.

Organization of American States

Apr. 11—At the opening session of a meeting of the Organization of American States in Washington, Secretary General Galo Plaza calls for a "concrete definition of the new U.S. policy toward Latin America."

United Nations

Apr. 5—U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim announces the appointment of Tang Ming-chao of China as Under Secretary General for Political Affairs and Decolonization.

Apr. 20—The U.N. military staff welcomes the Chinese delegation headed by Lin Fang to the committee, made up of representatives from the 5 permanent members of the U.N. Security Council.

War in Indochina

Apr. 2—U.S. military sources report that after 3 days of intense North Vietnamese artillery and rocket attacks, thousands of North Vietnamese troops are crossing the demilitarized zone and driving South Vietnamese defenders from their northernmost defense positions. The North Vietnamese appear to be headed for Quangtri, capital city of the northernmost province of South Vietnam.

Apr. 3—Saigon sources report that an estimated 12,000-15,000-man North Vietnamese force is ad-

vancing southward behind tanks and artillery in Quangtri Province and that South Vietnam's defenders have abandoned the northern half of the province to the invaders. Heavy clouds have made U.S. and South Vietnamese air attacks ineffective for the last 4 days.

Apr. 5—American planes fly 145 strikes against North Vietnamese positions south of the DMZ. American sources say that North Vietnamese forces are continuing to pour across the DMZ into South Vietnam while Hanoi radio continues to call the invasion the work of "liberation forces."

Apr. 6—U.S. sources in Saigon report that a new drive by North Vietnamese forces in Binhlong Province is apparently aimed at the district capital of Locninh, 60 miles north of Saigon. The enemy forces are reported to be using both tanks and infantry.

Apr. 7—The U.S. command announces that U.S. Air Force and Navy units have attacked targets in North Vietnam.

North Vietnamese forces continue to press their attack on the city of Quangtri in the north and in Binhlong Province in the south, 50 miles from Saigon.

Apr. 8—The North Vietnamese are reported to be opening a 3d front in the Central Highlands aimed at Kontum.

U.S. planes fly 237 air strikes in North Vietnam, while B-52 bombers fly 19 missions. There are now 4 U.S. Navy aircraft carriers operating off Vietnam for the first time since 1968.

Apr. 11—U.S. sources report that North Vietnamese forces attacking Quangtri have suffered heavy losses. American B-52's have struck at the Vinh area, 145 miles north of the DMZ.

Pentagon sources announce that 2 additional squadrons of B-52 bombers have been sent to Indochina, increasing the number of giant American planes in the combat zone to about 130.

Apr. 12—American aircraft make heavy raids in the Central Highlands region and hit supply depots inside North Vietnam.

Apr. 13—Washington sources reveal that American naval strength near Vietnam has increased to 35,000 men plus from 20 to 30 vessels; 260 fighter aircraft and 80 reconnaissance aircraft are also operating.

Apr. 14—North Vietnamese forces occupy half of

Anloc, 60 miles from Saigon in Binhlong Province. Apr. 17—The U.S. command reports that American planes attacked Hanoi and Haiphong harbor yesterday. Hanoi radio reports that a Soviet freighter in Haiphong harbor was damaged in the raids.

Apr. 19—While North Vietnamese troops press attacks against Anloc, American air support reaches record levels, with 250 strikes today in the vicinity of Anloc alone.

Apr. 20—The U.S. command reports that North Vietnamese MIG fighters attacked American warships in the Gulf of Tonkin today. More than 700 U.S. fighter-bombers and more than 100 B-52 bombers are involved in the air support mission for the South Vietnamese forces. North Vietnamese forces are attacking heavily around Quangtri in the north, Kontum in the Central Highlands and Laikhe in the south near Saigon.

South Vietnamese sources report that more than 250,000 civilians have become refugees as a result of the North Vietnamese invasion of the south.

Apr. 22—The U.S. command reports that B-52 bombers and Navy fighter-bombers have struck at targets in an area about 80 miles south of Hanoi.

The South Vietnamese command reports that a 10,000-man relief force has given up efforts to relieve the besieged town of Anloc.

It is reported that North Vietnamese forces have gained control of a large portion of the Mekong Delta area in the southern portion of South Vietnam.

Apr. 24—The South Vietnam command reports that Anloc is still standing off North Vietnamese forces; the North Vietnamese are attacking in the Central Highlands around Kontum.

Apr. 25—American sources report that after a 3-week offensive, the North Vietnamese hold more than half of 3 South Vietnamese provinces: Quangtri in the north, Kontum in the Central Highlands and Binhlong in the south.

Apr. 27—After a month's break, the Paris peace talks resume in a fruitless session. It is hinted that secret parleys may take place and lead to some concrete results.

Apr. 29—Saigon sources report that the North Vietnamese have overrun the town of Dongha, tightening their grip around the besieged city of Quangtri. The North Vietnamese have completely cut off Kontum in the Central Highlands.

Apr. 30—The U.S. command reports that more than 50 American military and civilian advisers are cut off in the city of Quangtri. North Vietnamese artillery continues to bombard the city very heavily.

Military sources report that thousands of people are fleeing Kontum in the Central Highlands. 10,000 people have been evacuated by air to Pleiku to the south. Large enemy forces are reported

within striking distance of Saigon. Anloc is under heavy artillery attack by the North Vietnamese.

Returning to the Paris peace talks, Le Duc Tho, a member of North Vietnam's Politburo, says he is in Paris to negotiate "a just and equitable peaceful solution to the Vietnamese problem" with the U.S.

ARGENTINA

Apr. 10—General Juan Carlos Sánchez, commander of the Second Army Corps, is assassinated; Fiat official Oberdan Sallustro, who has been a hostage of Marxist terrorists since March 21, is slain a few hours later.

BANGLADESH

Apr. 4—The U.S. recognizes Bangladesh.

Apr. 10—The 421-member Constituent Assembly meets in Dacca to frame a constitution.

BOLIVIA

(See *Brazil, U.S.S.R.*)

BRAZIL

Apr. 3—President Emílio G. Médici sends Congress a constitutional amendment postponing state gubernatorial elections, which were scheduled for 1974. The amendment, strongly protested by the opposition Brazilian Democratic Movement, is assured of passage.

Apr. 4—President Emílio G. Médici meets Bolivian President Hugo Banzer Suárez on the border of Bolivia to sign agreements formalizing Brazil's aid program for Bolivia.

BURMA

Apr. 20—An official announcement reveals that Premier Ne Win has resigned his post as an army general; most army members of the Cabinet have also resigned from the military to make up Burma's first civilian government in 10 years. A new civilian constitution is being drafted.

CANADA

(See also *U.S., Foreign Policy*)

Apr. 24—An 11-day strike of 200,000 public servants in the province of Quebec ends; teachers, civil servants and some 1.5 million schoolchildren return to schools and government offices.

CHILE

Apr. 13—President Salvador Allende Gossens addresses the 3d United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and asks the conference to condemn the American-owned International Telephone and Telegraph Company for its interference in Chilean politics.

Apr. 18—Allende reveals plans to expropriate ITT's Chilean holdings; ITT owns 70 per cent of the Chilean Telephone Company.

Apr. 20—In Paris, 12 creditor nations including the U.S. grant Chile credit relief in exchange for a pledge that all nationalizations will be compensated in accord with "Chilean and international law."

Apr. 28—An anti-Marxist slate wins control of the University of Chile in an election to determine whether the university will remain independent or become an arm of the Allende government.

CHINA, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF

Apr. 8—The official Rumanian press agency *Agerpress* announces that China and Rumania have signed a civil aviation agreement.

It is reported in *The New York Times* that Liu Hsing-yuan has been replaced as chairman of the ruling Revolutionary Committee of Kwangtung Province; Liu was a long-time associate of the ousted former deputy leader of China, Lin Piao.

CYPRUS

Apr. 2—Archbishop Makarios, Cypriote President, states that his government is willing to discuss general disarmament on Cyprus as a move to reduce tension between the Turkish and Greek Cypriotes.

EGYPT

Apr. 6—Egypt breaks relations with Jordan, criticizing King Hussein's plan for a federation of Jordanians and Palestinians. (See "Jordan," *Current History*, May, 1972, p. 269.)

Apr. 27—President Anwar Sadat arrives in Moscow for his second visit in 3 months.

Apr. 29—At the close of a 2-day visit, Sadat leaves Moscow; a joint communiqué reveals that Egyptian and Soviet leaders have "reached agreement on further strengthening of military cooperation."

EL SALVADOR

Apr. 4—Congress declares a 30-day state of siege; President Fidel Sánchez Hernández declared martial law after the abortive leftist coup of March 25.

FRANCE

Apr. 23—with 60 per cent of the eligible voters voting, the Common Market Treaty is approved by 68 per cent, in a referendum on the entrance of Britain, Norway, Denmark and Ireland to the European Economic Community.

GERMANY, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF (East)

Apr. 29—It is reported from Berlin that the government has announced a \$2.5-billion reform program

to extend through 1975. Pensions and welfare payments are raised; rents are lowered; private firms and semi-private concerns are to sell out to the government by May 15; child allowances and aid for the newly married are extended; top salaries for businessmen, scientists and artists are to be reduced.

GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF (West)

(See also *United Kingdom, Great Britain*)

Apr. 5—The federal cartel office in West Berlin announces that about \$15-million worth of fines have been levied again 9 West German and foreign-controlled companies with illegal cartels in domestic and foreign markets for unprocessed synthetic fibers.

Apr. 7—West Germany and the Soviet Union initial a long-term trade agreement.

Apr. 23—in a state election in Baden-Wurttemberg, the conservative Christian Democratic Union wins 53 per cent of the vote, defeating the Brandt government's coalition.

In Bonn, *Bundestag* deputy Wilhelm Helms announces that he is leaving the Free Democratic party, which is a partner with the Social Democrats in the government's coalition. Helms' action leaves Chancellor Willy Brandt's parliamentary majority at 249, the exact figure he needs for approval of his *Ostpolitik*.

Apr. 27—Willy Brandt's ruling coalition defeats a vote of no-confidence; the opposition receives 247 votes—2 short of the required majority in the 496-member *Bundestag*.

Apr. 28—The *Bundestag* splits 247-247 on a motion to approve the federal budget; this is the first time in its 30 months in office that the Brandt Cabinet has lost a vote.

GHANA

Apr. 27—Former President Kwame Nkrumah dies in exile in Guinea.

INDIA

(See also *Pakistan*)

Apr. 25—in Islamabad, a 17-member Indian delegation begins conferences aimed at arranging a meeting between Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and Pakistani President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

Apr. 30—After 4 days of conferences, the 17-man Indian delegation leaves Islamabad; a joint communiqué is issued revealing that an agenda has been set for talks between Pakistani President Bhutto and Prime Minister Gandhi, "toward the end of May or the beginning of June at New Delhi."

IRAQ

(See *U.S.S.R.*)

ISRAEL

Apr. 14—In Jerusalem, Premier Golda Meir meets with a special diplomatic envoy from Rumania; 2 weeks ago, Rumanian President Nicolae Ceausescu met with Egypt's President and Palestinian guerrilla leaders in Cairo.

Apr. 18—Official sources in Jerusalem report that Premier Meir has accepted an invitation to visit Rumania in the near future.

JAPAN

Apr. 12—Japan agrees to give Thailand \$208 million in credit to help Thailand's 3d 5-year economic and social development plan.

Apr. 27—In Tokyo, some 1.6 million transportation workers strike and paralyze the nation's trains and subways.

JORDAN

(See also *Egypt*)

Apr. 7—Egypt's ending of diplomatic relations with Jordan is sharply criticized by King Hussein, who describes Egypt's action as an "appeasement" of the Palestinian guerrillas.

MALTA

Apr. 2—Prime Minister Dom Mintoff arrives in Peking; 100,000 welcome his arrival.

Apr. 9—In Hong Kong, Mintoff says that he has reached an economic agreement with Chinese officials. *Hsinhua*, the Chinese press agency, terms the Mintoff visit "successful."

PAKISTAN

(See also *India*)

Apr. 17—In a 3-day session, the National Assembly approves the interim constitution, gives President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto a vote of confidence, and promises to end martial law. 84 of the 137 legislators are members of Bhutto's People's party.

Apr. 21—After 5 years, martial law is lifted; Bhutto is sworn in as President.

Apr. 25—Pathan leader Abdul Wali Khan, head of the National Awami party, criticizes Bhutto for denying civil rights and retaining a state of emergency.

RUMANIA

(See *China; Israel*)

SOUTH AFRICA

Apr. 6—13 nonwhite South Africans are sentenced to 5-8 years in prison for offenses under the Terrorism Act, after they have been found guilty of plotting to overthrow the government and conspiring to raise recruits for guerrilla training. All 13 pleaded not guilty.

TANZANIA

Apr. 8—Sheik Abeid Amani Karume, ruler of Zanzibar and First Vice President of the United Republic of Tanzania, is assassinated.

THAILAND

(See *Japan*)

TURKEY

(See also *U.S.S.R.*)

Apr. 3—In a letter to party leaders, President Cevdet Sunay asks for suspension of political activity and a period of rule by decree because "the current state of affairs is endangering the democratic regime and the integrity of the country."

Apr. 17—Premier Nihat Erim resigns; Defense Minister Ferit Melen is named caretaker Premier by President Sunay. Erim's efforts to quell a left-wing urban guerrilla movement have not been supported by Parliament.

Apr. 29—President Sunay names Ali Suat Hayri Urguplu, a former ambassador to the U.S., as Premier.

U.S.S.R.

Apr. 4—The Soviet Embassy in Stockholm reveals that it refused to issue a visa to the secretary of the Swedish Academy to go to Moscow to present the Nobel Prize for Literature to Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn.

Apr. 7—It is reported in La Paz that the Soviet Embassy has asked for exit visas for 69 of its 119 diplomats and other employees in Bolivia. They have been ordered to leave Bolivia by Bolivia's Minister of Interior on charges of espionage and contact with subversive elements.

Apr. 9—The U.S.S.R. and Iraq sign a 15-year treaty of friendship and cooperation; the agreement is signed in Baghdad by President Ahmed Hassan al-Bakr and Soviet Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin.

Apr. 11—President Nikolai V. Podgorny flies to Ankara for an official visit; he is the first Soviet head of state ever to visit Turkey.

The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. sign an expanded 2-year cultural exchange agreement allowing U.S. and Soviet lecturers to give regular courses in one another's universities. This is the 8th in a series of cultural exchanges that began in 1958.

Apr. 13—A group of Soviet officials leave Moscow for Washington to open negotiations with the U.S. on a Soviet debt owed the U.S. from the World War II Lend-Lease Program.

Apr. 17—The U.S.S.R. accuses the U.S. of damaging 4 Soviet merchant ships during U.S. raids on Haiphong.

UNITED KINGDOM

Great Britain

Apr. 12—Labour members of Parliament vote 129 to 96 to support a leadership decision calling for a referendum on Britain's entry into the E.E.C. Six Labour party members, including deputy leader Roy Jenkins, have resigned because they do not support the party's opposition to the E.E.C.

Apr. 21—Prime Minister Edward Heath and West German Chancellor Willy Brandt end 2 days of talks in London.

Northern Ireland

Apr. 7—73 internees and detainees are freed by the government as it abandons its policy of interning terrorist suspects without trial. Violence continues.

Apr. 15—Joseph McCann, a leading member of the I.R.A., is killed by British soldiers in Belfast.

Apr. 18—Some 5,000 people march at McCann's funeral; violence continues.

Apr. 19—in London, an official inquiry finds no misconduct in the British Army killing of 13 Roman Catholic civilians in Londonderry, January 30; tactics of the troops are questioned, but the tribunal concludes that the first shot was fired by the I.R.A.

Apr. 27—The government declares an amnesty for all persons convicted of taking part in illegal marches in Northern Ireland in the past 4 months and lifts the ban on parades in that province.

UNITED STATES

Civil Rights

Apr. 5—The federal conspiracy case against the Rev. Phillip F. Berrigan and six others ends in a mistrial, although Father Berrigan and Sister Elizabeth McAlister are convicted of a lesser charge of smuggling letters in and out of prison.

Apr. 6—A three-judge federal court declares unconstitutional a Pennsylvania law compensating parents for tuition paid for children attending nonpublic schools.

Economy

Apr. 7—The Labor Department says the unemployment rate in March was 5.9 per cent, compared to 5.7 per cent in February. The department also says that both union and nonunion wages have risen an average of 3 per cent in the four months since the expiration of the wage-price freeze, an annual rate of 9 per cent.

Apr. 19—According to the Commerce Department, the "real" growth of the gross national product in the first quarter of 1972 was 5.3 per cent, while the price index for the entire gross national product during the same period rose at an annual rate of 6.2 per cent.

Apr. 21—The Labor Department says that the Consumer Price Index for March, seasonally adjusted, shows no price rise; this is the first such reading of the index since late 1966.

Apr. 25—The Labor Department says that wages and salaries of American workers increased four times as fast as their productivity per man hour in the first quarter of 1972.

Elections

(See also *Politics*)

Apr. 4—Senator George McGovern (D., S.D.) wins the Wisconsin Democratic presidential primary with 30 per cent of the vote and 54 of the state's 67 delegates. Governor George C. Wallace of Alabama receives 22 per cent of the vote but no delegates, while Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) receives 21 per cent of the vote and 13 delegates. Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D., Me.) receives 10 per cent of the vote, Senator Henry M. Jackson (D., Wash.) 8 per cent, Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York, 7 per cent.

Apr. 25—in the Pennsylvania Democratic presidential primary, Senator Humphrey wins with 35 per cent of the vote. Governor Wallace and Senator McGovern each receive 21 per cent while Senator Muskie finishes 4th with 20 per cent. The delegate count breaks down to Humphrey, 57, McGovern, 37, Muskie, 29 and Wallace, 2.

Senator McGovern captures 52 per cent of the vote and all 102 delegates in the Massachusetts Democratic presidential primary. Muskie receives 22 per cent of the vote while Humphrey and Wallace each receive 8 per cent.

Foreign Policy

(See also *Intl. War in Indochina; U.S.S.R.*)

Apr. 7—Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird says that heavy bombing of North Vietnam will continue until the North Vietnamese withdraw the forces that crossed into South Vietnam last week and show interest in "serious" peace talks.

Apr. 8—Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz arrives in Moscow to open negotiations for regular long-term sales of American grain to the Soviet Union.

Apr. 10—in remarks interpreted as being directed to the Soviet Union's military aid to North Vietnam, President Richard M. Nixon says that no "great power" should encourage, "directly or indirectly, other nations to use force or armed aggression against its neighbors."

Apr. 13—President Nixon arrives in Canada for a 2-day state visit.

Apr. 15—President Nixon and Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau of Canada sign a joint agreement to begin the job of cleaning up the Great Lakes.

Apr. 25—The White House announces that the

United States and South Vietnam are prepared to resume the Paris peace talks. It is also revealed that the President sent his national security adviser, Henry A. Kissinger, on a secret mission to Moscow last week.

Apr. 26—In a televised address, President Nixon announces that he will withdraw 20,000 more American troops from Vietnam by July 1, reducing troop strength to 49,000. He reports that General Creighton Abrams, American commander in Indochina, says that the South Vietnamese can withstand the North Vietnamese offensive if the United States continues to provide air and sea support. The President says the United States will continue to provide such support.

Apr. 30—Secretary of State William P. Rogers says that the bombing of targets around Hanoi and Haiphong has led to a weakened North Vietnamese military effort in South Vietnam.

Government

Apr. 3—President Richard M. Nixon signs legislation devaluing the dollar by raising the price of an ounce of gold from \$35 to \$38.

Apr. 4—Secretary of the Navy John H. Chaffee resigns, presumably to return to Rhode Island to run for the Senate.

Apr. 9—James F. Byrnes, "Assistant President" under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and former Supreme Court Justice, Secretary of State, and Governor of South Carolina, dies at age 92.

Apr. 11—Donald Rumsfeld, director of President Nixon's Cost of Living Council, says that at least 24 major companies with sales of \$50 million or more have apparently violated Price Commission regulations by raising profit margins above allowable levels. He says such companies are subject to price rollbacks and court action unless they can "justify" apparently excessive profit margins.

Apr. 12—President Nixon says that he will nominate Benjamin L. Hooks, a Memphis lawyer, as the first black to serve on the Federal Communications Commission.

Apr. 14—The Justice Department says that it plans to file antitrust suits against the major television networks, charging that they "have monopolized and restrained trade" in prime-time television entertainment programs.

Apr. 24—Price Commission Chairman C. Jackson Grayson, Jr., says there will be hundreds of millions of dollars in price reductions as a result of enforced limits on business profit margins. The commission's profit-margin policy limits companies to a rate of profit equivalent to an average of their best two years' profit in the last 3 fiscal years.

Apr. 27—The Senate Judiciary Committee concludes 6 weeks of hearings involving the Justice Depart-

ment's settlement of antitrust suits against the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation and votes 11 to 4 to send the nomination of Richard G. Kleindienst for the post of Attorney General to the floor of the Senate.

Apr. 28—By a vote of 10 to 4, the Senate Finance Committee rejects President Nixon's guaranteed income proposal and substitutes a "must work" plan.

Politics

(See also *Elections*)

Apr. 5—Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York withdraws from the Democratic presidential nomination race.

Apr. 27—Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D., Me.) withdraws from the active pursuit of the Democratic presidential nomination but offers himself as a possible compromise choice.

Science and Space

Apr. 16—The Apollo 16 mission to the moon for the purpose of exploring the volcanic-like features of the lunar mountains is successfully launched from Cape Kennedy, Florida.

Apr. 27—The 11-day Apollo 16 moon mission is successfully completed with a safe splashdown in the Pacific Ocean.

Supreme Court

Apr. 3—The Supreme Court rules that the Atomic Energy Commission has sole jurisdiction over regulating the discharge of radioactive debris from nuclear power plants.

Apr. 18—By a vote of 4 to 3, the court upholds a Massachusetts loyalty oath requiring state employees to "oppose" the violent overthrow of the government.

URUGUAY

Apr. 18—A 2-day general strike by Communist-controlled unions begins.

Apr. 17—9 people are reported killed in a predawn gun battle around a district office of the Communist party. 21 persons have been killed since April 14 in the conflict between the government and the leftist Tupamaro guerrillas.

VIETNAM, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF (North)

(See also *Intl. War in Indochina*)

Apr. 7—Hanoi's chargé d'affaires in Paris asks the French government to use its influence with Washington to try to stop the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam.

VIETNAM, REPUBLIC OF (South)

(See *Intl. War in Indochina*)

Current History Index, January-June, 1972

Volume 62, Numbers 365-370

SUBJECTS

ARGENTINA

Argentina's Bureaucratic Oligarchies, Feb., 70.

AUSTRALIA

Australia, 1972, entire issue, Mar., 1972;
Australia Today, Mar., 156;
Australian Federalism, Mar., 151;
Australian Society, Mar., 133;
Australian Strategic Perspectives, Mar., 143;
Communiqué of the ANZUS Council's Twenty-First Meeting (doc), Mar., 162;
Historical Context of Australian-Japanese Relations, The, Mar., 138;
Nations of the Pacific (map), inside back cover, Mar.;
Open Options: Australia's Foreign Policy in the Seventies, Mar., 129;
Party Politics in Australia, Mar., 147.

BOLIVIA

Bolivia Swings Right, Feb., 86.

BOOK REVIEWS

Jan., 45; Feb., 110; Mar., 161; Apr., 209; May, 260.

BOOKS REVIEWED

Balabkins, Nicholas, *West German Reparations to Israel*, Jan., 52;
Ben-Gurion, David, *Israel: A Personal History*, Jan., 46;
Branyan, Robert L. and Larsen, Lawrence H. (eds.), *The Eisenhower Administration 1953-1961. A Documentary History*, Mar., 161;
Brzezinski, Zbigniew, *The Fragile Blossom. Crisis and Change in Japan*, Apr., 209;
Cameron, Roderick, *Australia. History and Horizons*, Mar., 161;
Curtis, Michael (ed.), *People and Politics in the Middle East*, Jan., 52;
Dekmejian, R. Hrair, *Egypt Under Nasir*, Jan., 45;
Emmerson, John K., *Arms, Yen and Power, The Japanese Dilemma*, Apr., 209;
Franck, Thomas M. and Weisband, Edward, *Word Politics: Verbal Strategy Among the Superpowers*, Apr., 215;
Gardner, W. J. and McIntyre, W. David, *Speeches and Documents on New Zealand History*, Mar., 161;
Grosser, Alfred, *Germany in Our Time*, May, 260;
Gunn, Peter, *A Concise History of Italy*, Mar., 161;
Haddad, George M., *Revolutions and Military Rule in the Middle East*, Vol. II, Jan., 47;
Jacobson, Jon, *Lacarno Diplomacy*, May, 260;
Kaiser, Karl and Morgan, Roger (eds.), *Britain and West Germany*, May, 260;
Kuan-I Chen and Uppal, Jogindar S. (eds.), *India and China, Studies in Comparative Development*, Mar., 169;
Lannoy, Richard, *The Speaking Tree: A Study of Indian Culture and Society*, May, 260;
Larsen, Lawrence H. and Branyan, Robert L. (eds.), *The*

Eisenhower Administration 1953-1961. A Documentary History, Mar., 161;
Leslie, C. Clement, *The Rift in Israel*, Jan., 45;
Love, Joseph L., *Rio Grande do Sul and Brazilian Regionalism, 1882-1930*, Feb., 111;
McGeehan, Robert, *The German Rearmament Question: American Diplomacy and European Defense after World War II*, May, 260;
McIntyre, W. David and Gardner, W. J. (eds.), *Speeches and Documents on New Zealand History*, Mar., 161;
Martin, John Stuart and Raymond, Ellsworth, *A Picture History of Eastern Europe*, Mar., 161;
Martz, John D. (ed.), *The Dynamics of Change in Latin American Politics* (2d ed.), Feb., 112;
Morgan, Roger and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Britain and West Germany*, May 260;
Payne, J. P. (ed.), *Germany Today: Introductory Studies*, May, 260;
Pierce, Joe E., *Understanding the Middle East*, Jan., 46;
Raymond, Ellsworth and Martin, John Stuart, *A Picture History of Eastern Europe*, Mar., 161;
Rustow, Dankwart A., *Middle Eastern Political Systems*, Jan., 46;
Shirley, Robert W., *The End of a Tradition. Culture Change and Development in the Município of Cunha, São Paulo, Brazil*, Feb., 111;
Silverman, Bertram (ed.), *Man and Socialism in Cuba: The Great Debate*, Feb., 110;
Stepan, Alfred, *The Military in Politics: Changing Patterns in Brazil*, Feb., 110;
Talmon, J. L., *Israel Among the Nations*, Jan., 45;
Uppal, Jogindar S. and Kuan-I Chen (eds.), *India and China, Studies in Comparative Development*, Mar., 169;
Wagley, Charles, *An Introduction to Brazil*, Feb., 111;
Weisband, Edward and Franck, Thomas M., *Word Politics: Verbal Strategy Among the Superpowers*, Apr., 215;
Whetten, Lawrence L., *Germany's Ostpolitik*, May, 260;
Winks, Robin W., *The Blacks in Canada*, Apr., 209.

BRAZIL

Brazil: New Model for National Development, Feb., 65.

CANADA

At the Interface: Canada and the United States in the Seventies, Apr., 181;
Canada (map), inside back cover, Apr.;
Canada and the World in the Seventies, Apr., 194;
Canada, 1972, entire issue, Apr., 1972;
Canadian-American Relations in Perspective, Apr., 177;
Canadian Economy, The, Apr., 203;
Canadian Political System: An Overview, Apr., 198;
French and English in Canada: Uneasy Union, Apr., 189;
Nature of Canadian Nationality, The, Apr., 185.

CENTRAL AMERICA

Critical Time for Mexico, A, Feb., 81;
Guatemala: Edge of an Abyss? Feb., 104.

CHILE.

Allende's First Year in Chile, Feb., 76.

CHRONOLOGY (See *The Month in Review*)

DOCUMENTS

Communiqué of the ANZUS Council's Twenty-First Meeting, Mar., 162;
Pact Between Poland and West Germany, 1970, May, 259;
President Nixon on Equal Educational Opportunity, 1972, June, 305;
Secretary Rogers Discusses a Middle East Peace Plan, Jan., 44;
U.S. Policy on Latin America, Feb., 109.

EGYPT

Egypt Since Nasser, Jan., 6.

GERMANY (See *West Germany*)

GUATEMALA

Guatemala: Edge of an Abyss? Feb., 104.

IRAN

Leadership Role for Iran, A? Jan., 25.

IRAQ

Iraq Under Baathist Rule, Jan., 31.

ISRAEL

Israel's Quest for Security, Jan., 1.

JAPAN

Historical Context of Australian-Japanese Relations, The, Mar., 138.

JORDAN

Jordan in Turmoil, Jan., 14.

LATIN AMERICA

Allende's First Year in Chile, Feb., 76;
Argentina's Bureaucratic Oligarchies, Feb., 70;
Bolivia Swings Right, Feb., 86;
Brazil: New Model for National Development? Feb., 65;
Critical Time for Mexico, A, Feb., 81;
Guatemala: Edge of an Abyss? Feb., 104;
Latin America (map), inside back cover, Feb.;
Latin America, 1972, entire issue, Feb., 1972;
Peru Under the Generals, Feb., 91;
U.S. Policy on Latin America (doc), Feb., 109;
Uruguay's Lost Paradise, Feb., 98.

LEBANON

Lebanon: The Politics of Survival, Jan., 20.

MAPS

Canada, inside back cover, Apr.;
Latin America, inside back cover, Feb.;
Local Revenues for Education in the U.S. (chart), inside back cover, June;
Middle East, The, inside back cover, Jan.;
Nations of the Pacific, inside back cover, Mar.;
Western Europe, inside back cover, May.

MEXICO

Critical Time for Mexico, A, Feb., 81.

MIDDLE EAST

Egypt Since Nasser, Jan., 6;
Iraq Under Baathist Rule, Jan., 31;
Israel's Quest for Security, Jan., 1;
Jordan in Turmoil, Jan., 14;
Leadership Role for Iran, A? Jan., 25;
Lebanon: The Politics of Survival, Jan., 20;
Middle East, The, entire issue, Jan., 1972;
Middle East, The (map), inside back cover, Jan.;
Secretary Rogers Discusses a Middle East Peace Plan (doc), Jan., 44;
Turkey: A Time of Troubles, Jan., 38.

MONTH IN REVIEW

Jan., 53; Feb., 119; Mar., 170; Apr., 218; May, 266;
June, 312.

NEW ZEALAND

Communiqué of the ANZUS Council's Twenty-First Meeting (doc), Mar., 162.

PERU

Peru Under the Generals, Feb., 91.

POLAND

Pact Between Poland and West Germany (doc), May, 259.

TURKEY

Turkey: A Time of Troubles, Jan., 38.

UNITED STATES

Aid to Nonpublic Schools: Historical and Social Perspectives, June, 302;
American School Finance: A History, entire issue, June;
At the Interface: Canada and the United States in the Seventies, Apr., 181;
Before the Public School: Education in Colonial America, June, 279;
Canadian-American Relations in Perspective, Apr., 177;
Changing Role of the American Public School, The, June, 286;
Communiqué of the ANZUS Council's Twenty-First Meeting (doc), Mar., 162;
Federal Financing of Education, 1945-1972, June, 298;
Financing American Education Today, June, 273;
Growing Federal Involvement in American Education, 1918-1945, June, 290;
Local Revenues for Education in the U.S. (Chart), inside back cover, June;
President Nixon on Equal Educational Opportunity, 1972 (doc), June, 305;
Rise of the Free Public School, The, June, 282;
Secretary Rogers Discusses a Middle East Peace Plan (doc), Jan., 44;
State and Local Efforts to Finance Schools Since 1945, June, 293;
U.S. Policy on Latin America (doc), Feb., 109.

URUGUAY

Uruguay's Lost Paradise, Feb., 98.

WEST EUROPE

Western Europe (map), inside back cover, May;
West Germany, 1972, entire issue, May, 1972.

WEST GERMANY

Challenge of West Germany's Social Market Economy,
The, May, 249;
Germany Between East and West, May, 225;

Germany's Westpolitik, May, 234;
Ostpolitik in Historical Perspective, May, 299;
Pact Between Poland and West Germany, 1970 (doc),
May, 259;
Politics in West Germany, May, 244;
West Germany, 1972, entire issue, May, 1972;
West Germany's Security Policy, May, 239;
West Germany's Trade: An Enviable Dilemma, May, 254.

AUTHORS

ALBINSKI, HENRY S.: Australian Society, Mar., 133.

ANDERBERG, MARY M.: Book Reviews, Feb., 110 ff.

ANGELL, ALAN: Allende's First Year in Chile, Feb., 76.

ANTHON, CARL G.: Germany's Westpolitik, May, 234.

BARBER, WILLARD F.: Book Reviews, Apr., 209.

BARNARD, HARRY V. AND BEST, JOHN HARDIN: Growing Federal Involvement in American Education, 1918-1945, June, 290.

BEST, JOHN HARDIN AND BARNARD, HARRY V.: Growing Federal Involvement in American Education, 1918-1945, June, 290.

BOTHWELL, ROBERT: Canada and the World in the Seventies, Apr., 194.

BRAUNTHAL, GERARD: Politics in West Germany, May, 244.

CARLETON, WILLIAM G.: The Rise of the Free Public School, June, 282.

DRUMMOND, ROBERT J.: The Canadian Political System: An Overview, Apr., 198.

FALCONE, DAVID J.: The Canadian Economy, Apr., 203.

FRIEDRICH, KLAUS: West Germany's Trade: An Enviable Dilemma, May, 254.

GOODSELL, JAMES NELSON: Guatemala: Edge of an Abyss? Feb., 104.

GOODWIN, CRAUFURD D.: Canadian-American Relations in Perspective, Apr., 177.

GORDON, BERNARD K.: Open Options: Australia's Foreign Policy in the Seventies, Mar., 129.

GRAEBNER, NORMAN A.: Germany Between East and West, May, 225.

GRATTAN, C. HARTLEY: The Historical Context of Australian-Japanese Relations, Mar., 138.

GRAYSON, GEORGE W.: Peru Under the Generals, Feb., 91.

HAGAN, CHARLES B.: Australia Today, Mar., 156.

HIRSCH, FELIX E.: Ostpolitik in Historical Perspective, May, 229.

HOWARD, HARRY N.: Jordan in Turmoil, Jan., 14.

JOHNSTONE, D. BRUCE: Financing American Education Today, June, 273.

JORDAN, DAVID C.: Argentina's Bureaucratic Oligarchies, Feb., 70.

KEPPEL, ANN M.: The Changing Role of the American Public School, 1865-1914, June, 286.

KRÖNER, ARNOLD F.: The Challenge of West Germany's Social Market Economy, May, 249.

LEACH, RICHARD H.: Australian Federalism, Mar., 151.

MC CLUSKEY, NEIL J.: Aid to Nonpublic Schools: Historical and Social Perspectives, June, 302.

MALLORY, J. R.: French and English in Canada: Uneasy Union, Apr., 189.

MIDDLEKAUFF, ROBERT: Before the Public School: Education in Colonial America, June, 279.

MORTON, W. L.: The Nature of Canadian Nationality, Apr., 185.

NEEDLER, MARTIN C.: A Critical Time for Mexico, Feb., 81.

POPPINO, ROLLIE E.: Brazil: New Model for National Development? Feb., 65.

POTHOLM, CHRISTIAN P.: At the Interface: Canada and the United States in the Seventies, Apr., 181.

REICH, BERNARD: Israel's Quest for Security, Jan., 1.

RICHARDSON, J. L.: Australian Strategic Perspective, Mar., 143.

RUBINSTEIN, ALVIN Z.: Egypt Since Nasser, Jan., 6.

SCHULTZ, ANN T.: A Leadership Role for Iran? Jan., 25.

SHAPIRO, SAMUEL: Uruguay's Lost Paradise, Feb., 98.

SIMPSON, DWIGHT J.: Turkey: A Time of Troubles, Jan., 38.

TAYLOR, ARTHUR YNE J.: Federal Financing of Education, 1945-1972, June, 298.

THOMAN, ROY E.: Iraq Under Baathist Rule, Jan., 31.

TRUMAN, TOM: Party Politics in Australia, Mar., 147.

VEILLETTE, PETER: State and Local Efforts to Finance Schools Since 1945, June, 293.

WHITEHEAD, LAWRENCE: Bolivia Swings Right, Feb., 86.

WOLF, JOHN B.: Lebanon: The Politics of Survival, Jan., 20.

ZIEMKE, EARL F.: West Germany's Security Policy, May, 239.

Local Revenues for Education — 1970

Percent of All Expenditures



Sources of Education Revenues



SOURCE: THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FINANCE

Property of
AMBASSADOR COLLEGE LIBRARY
Big Sandy, Texas

AVAILABLE FROM Current History

Academic Year 1972-1973

- American School Finance: A History (6/72)
- American School Costs (7/72)
- Financing America's Schools Tomorrow (8/72)
- Mainland China, 1972 (9/72)
- The Soviet Union, 1972 (10/72)
- India and South Asia, 1972 (11/72)

- Southeast Asia, 1972 (12/72)
- The Middle East, 1973 (1/73)
- Latin America, 1973 (2/73)
- Africa, 1973 (3/73)
- West Europe, 1973 (4/73)
- East Europe, 1973 (5/73)

Still Available

AREA STUDIES

- Latin America, 1971 (2/71)
- Africa, 1971 (3/71)
- Japan, 1971 (4/71)
- East Europe, 1971 (5/71)
- Communist China, 1971 (9/71)
- The Soviet Union, 1971 (10/71)
- Southeast Asia, 1971 (12/71)
- The Middle East, 1972 (1/72)
- Latin America, 1972 (2/72)
- Australia, 1972 (3/72)
- Canada, 1972 (4/72)
- West Germany, 1972 (5/72)

CURRENT HISTORY ANNUALS

Day-by-day, country-by-country reviews of each year's events, adapted from *Current History's* "Month in Review," are indexed in a single volume annually as a service to our readers. Each Annual also contains the index to a year's issues of *Current History*.

AMERICAN ISSUES

- The American Cities (12/68)
- U.S. Military Commitments in Asia (8/69)
- Black America (9/69)
- U.S. Resources: A Tally Sheet (6/70)
- America's Polluted Environment (7/70)
- Options for a Cleaner America (8/70)
- Urban America (11/70)
- The American System of Justice (6/71)
- American Justice at Work (7/71)
- Improving Justice in America (8/71)
- Welfare and the New American Federalism (11/71)

CURRENT HISTORY BINDER

A sturdy, hard-cover binder at a reasonable cost will protect *Current History* for permanent reference. Each issue can be placed in the binder every month. The easy-to-use binder holds 12 issues plus the Annual securely in place over flexible steel rods.

ONE-YEAR SUBSCRIPTION: \$9.50; TWO-YEAR SUBSCRIPTION: \$18.50.

NINE-MONTH SUBSCRIPTION: \$7.95.

SEVEN-MONTH STUDENT SUBSCRIPTION: \$5.95.

SPECIFIC ISSUE PRICE: \$1.00 per copy; 10 or more of the same issue, 65¢ per copy.

CURRENT HISTORY ANNUAL PRICE: \$2.45. BINDER PRICE: \$3.50.

CURRENT HISTORY • 4225 Main Street • Philadelphia, Pa. 19127

SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION OFFER: your choice of 3 free issues.

- 1 year \$9.50, plus 3 free issues marked above.
- 2 years \$18.50, plus 3 free issues marked above.
- Please send me the issues I have indicated above in the quantities I have marked.
- Send me 9-month subscriptions. Send me 7-month subscriptions.

CURRENT HISTORY ANNUALS

- Annual, 1972, at \$2.45 each
- Annual, 1971, at \$2.45 each
- Annual, 1970, at \$2.45 each

CURRENT HISTORY BINDER

- Current History Binders at \$3.50 each.

Name

Address

City State Zip Code

Check enclosed. Bill me. Add 50¢ for Canada; \$1.00 for foreign.

All these offers are good only on orders mailed directly to the publisher.

Specific issue price based on a single mailing address for all issues ordered.

4575
LIBRARY
SANDY
TEXAS

Property of
AMBASSADOR COLLEGE LIBRARY
Big Sandy, Texas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED